# THE Lutheran Quarterly

olume V AUGUST, 1953 Number 3

Office of Publication, 18 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly,* founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review,* founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly,* Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly,* Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, books for review to the Book Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription $2.75 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

*Editor*
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

*Managing Editor*
A. J. ENGELBRECHT
1250 Nowata St., Dubuque, Iowa

*Book Editor*
WARREN G. QUANBECK
2245 Luther Place, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

*Circulation Manager*
PAUL M. LINDBERG
Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois

## EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
GETTYSBURG, PA.

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
COLUMBUS, OHIO

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
DUBUQUE, IOWA

LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL, MINN.

AUGSBURG SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

CENTRAL SEMINARY
FREMONT, NEB.

CHICAGO LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MAYWOOD, ILL.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SEMINARY OF CANADA
WATERLOO, ONT.

GRANDVIEW SEMINARY
DES MOINES, IOWA

HAMMA DIVINITY SCHOOL
SPRINGFIELD, OHIO

LUTHERAN SEMINARY
SASKATOON, SASK.

NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

SOUTHERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
COLUMBIA, S. C.

SUOMI SEMINARY
HANCOCK, MICH.

TRINITY SEMINARY
BLAIR, NEB.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN SEMINARY
BERKELEY, CALIF.

## AIMS AND POLICY

I. *Aims:* The aims of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.

II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume V AUGUST, 1953 Number 3

## CONTENTS

BIBLICAL FAITH AND CULTIC EVOLUTION ..... *George E. Mendenhall* 235

THE CAUSE OF SIN ..... *T. A. Kantonen* 259

NOTES AND STUDIES

Toward a Lutheran View of Church and State, *George W. Forell, Herman A. Preus, and Jaroslav J. Pelikan* 280
How Did Jesus Regard Himself? ..... *William C. Berkemeyer* 290
The Transition From Slovak to English ..... *J. Igor Bella* 297
Saturday School for Sunday School ..... *William H. Keil* 300
Navy Chaplaincy and the National Lutheran Council, *Gordon Lindemann and C. Charles Bachmann* 303
Was Ecclesia Plantanda Muhlenberg's Motto? ..... *Theodore G. Tappert* 308

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Young, *My Servants the Prophets* (W. H. Cooper) ..... 312
Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (R. T. Stamm) ..... 313
Birnbaum, *The Qumram Scrolls and Palaeography* (H. L. Creager) ..... 316
Møller-Christensen, *Bibelens Dyreliv* (E. Mengers) ..... 316
Herklots, *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament* (W. Quanbeck) ..... 317
Johnson, ed., *The Joy of Study* (W. Quanbeck) ..... 317
Lindroth, ed., *En bok om kyrkans ämbete* (C. Rasmussen) ..... 318
Morrison, *The Unfinished Reformation* (C. Bergendoff) ..... 319
Hubben, *Four Prophets of Our Destiny* (T. A. Kantonen) ..... 320
Braden, *The Scriptures of Mankind* ..... 321
Whitehouse, *Christian Faith and the Scientific Attitude* (G. F. Schott, Jr.) ..... 321
Bucer, *Instruction in Christian Love* ..... 322
Parkes, *God at Work* (H. Keiter) ..... 322
Olson, *A Centenary History as Related to the Baptist General Conference of America* 323
Williams, *What Americans Believe and How They Worship* ..... 323
Ferm, ed., *The American Church of the Protestant Heritage* (W. D. Allbeck) ..... 324
Lobinger, *The Better Church School* (A. J. Traver) ..... 325
Knubel, *Pastoral Counseling* (C. C. Madsen) ..... 325
Macaulay, *After This Manner* (C. R. Bomgren) ..... 326
McNeer and Ward, *Martin Luther* ..... 326
Wills, *Alice in Bibleland* ..... 327
McKnight, *The Easter Story* ..... 327
Lutheran Evangelism Conference, *Share Christ Today* ..... 327
Gyldenvand, *What Am I Saying?* (C. R. Bomgren) ..... 327
Butterfield, *Sexual Harmony in Marriage* ..... 327
Goldenhuys, *The Intimate Life, or The Christian's Sex Life* ..... 327
Gaylord, *Mr. Bradford Gets Around* (C. R. Bomgren) ..... 328
Rothnem, *Poetic Meditations on the Scriptures* ..... 328
Miller, *The Word of Truth* (C. R. Bomgren) ..... 328



PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

# CONTRIBUTORS

It is a matter of real regret to have to announce the resignation of CONRAD BERGENDOFF as editor and of THEODORE S. LIEFELD as managing editor of the QUARTERLY after four and one-half years of service.

GEORGE E. MENDENHALL is associate professor of Near Eastern Studies in the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. He was formerly assistant professor in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio. His article is based on the Swope lecture on liturgics which he delivered at the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Penna., on May 1, 1952.

T. A. KANTONEN is professor of Systematic Theology at Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio. His article is based on the Holman lecture which he delivered at the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Penna., on May 8, 1953.

GEORGE W. FORELL, professor of Philosophy in Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minnesota, HERMAN A. PREUS, professor of Historical Theology in Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota, and JAROSLAV J. PELIKAN, professor of Historical Theology in Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri, were members of a study commission which prepared a statement on church and state for the Seminar on the Church and National Life which was held in Alexandria, Virginia, in April, 1953.

WILLIAM C. BERKEMEYER is pastor of St. Matthew's Church in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, and author of a life of Christ which is soon to appear from the press.

J. IGOR BELLA, formerly pastor of Holy Trinity Slovak Church in Bridgeport, Connecticut, is a representative of the Lutheran World Federation in Europe.

WILLIAM H. KEIL is pastor of the Church of the Holy Trinity in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

GORDON LINDEMANN, former missionary to Liberia, is currently on duty with the U. S. Navy as a chaplain in the Military Transport Service, and C. CHARLES BACHMANN, former institutional chaplain for the United Lutheran Social Mission Society of Illinois, is currently on active duty as a chaplain at the Naval Air Station in Memphis, Tennessee.

Among the reviewers of books in this number are WILLIAM H. COOPER, professor of the Old Testament at Northwestern Theological Seminary, Minneapolis Minnesota; RAYMOND T. STAMM, professor of the New Testament in the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania; HAROLD L. CREAGER, professor of the Old Testament in the Southern Seminary, Columbia, South Carolina; ETHAN MENGERS, professor of the Old Testament at Trinity Theological Seminary, Blair, Nebraska; CARL C. RASMUSSEN, professor of Systematic Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania; CONRAD BERGENDOFF, president of Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois; W. D. ALLBECK, professor of Church History in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio; AMOS JOHN TRAVER, professor of Practical Theology in Hamma Divinity School; C. C. MADSEN, professor of Practical Theology in Trinity Theological Seminary; HERMAN KEITER, professor of Religion in Hartwick College, Oneonta, New York; CHARLES R. BOMGREN, pastor of Augustana Lutheran Church, Meriden, Connecticut.

# Biblical Faith and Cultic Evolution

By George E. Mendenhall

THE purpose of this paper is to present a general survey of the religious ideas of worship as understood in the life and faith of Old and New Testament times. The title indicates that such ideas do not and did not stand still, but are constantly changing and developing. The title also indicates that what is most important in the evolution of plant and animal life—namely, those unexplained sudden mutations which represent and become new types—is also characteristic of biblical faith.

The general thesis which this paper presents is somewhat as follows: In the pagan religions of the ancient Near East before the time of Moses there was a general concept of worship and service of the gods which was almost exclusively cultic in nature. A sudden mutation took place in early Old Testament faith, in which service of God was primarily non-cultic, but rather social and ethical in nature. But the cult had such strong appeal and dynamic behind it that, under the influence of religious leadership, and perhaps economic interest, service of the God tended toward more and more cultic form. This resulted in reformation, which took place in the prophetic protest against cult. In the "liturgical revival" of the present time there are strong dangers of a new reversion to the common type of pagan religious ideas from which biblical faith is a mutation, and as Schian states, "the liturgical revival of the present day is being carried on without adequate examination of the theological presuppositions."[1]

This paper might also be presented as an attempt to bridge, to some extent, the great gap between biblical and systematic approaches to Christian doctrine. It has often been pointed out that the two are far apart, that most of the findings of biblical scholarship have never been assimilated or even taken seriously by systematic theology. Doubtless much of the blame for this lies on the shoulders of biblical scholars themselves, who have in the past been too little concerned about the-

1 *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* art. "Gottesdienst."

ology. If Karl Holl is correct in maintaining that Luther himself is the father of modern biblical criticism and method,[2] it should be clear that historical study of the Bible and theology are in need of each other.

It seems to be pretty well agreed today that the New Testament cannot be adequately understood except from the background of the Old. Ever since the close of World War I, the feeling among Old Testament scholars has increased that the Old Testament itself cannot be adequately understood apart from the background of earlier pagan religion.[3] Therefore, our starting point for an understanding of the biblical experience of worship and the meaning of service of God must be the heathenism from which Mosaic religion is a sudden mutation. It has the advantage of putting in more clear relief the nature of biblical worship, for it is often much easier to say what a given phenomenon is not, than what it is.

Most of the religions of the world would agree on the major premise of religion: that man was created for the service of the gods. Babylonian religion puts it this way in the Creation Epic. After the defeat of the powers of chaos in this dualistic cosmos, Marduk, the victor, declares: "Blood I will mass and cause man to be. I will establish a savage, 'man' shall be his name. Verily, savage-man I will create. He shall be charged with the service of the gods that they may be at ease!"[4] In the sequel, Marduk creates man from clay mingled with the blood of Kingu, the god who was responsible for the rebellion of chaos—Tiamat, and "out of his blood they fashioned mankind. Ea imposed the service and let free the gods."[5] In other words, man's bondage is the means by which the freedom of the gods is secured. The actual meaning of the word here translated "service" includes both secular and sacred tasks, as used in other Babylonian texts.[6] The secular meaning is that of plain, hard work, and its results are fatigue, tribulation, trouble, but such usages seem to have no religious connection. The service of the gods consists only in those tasks which are connected with the temple cultus, such as the construction of temples, offering of

2 Karl Holl, "Luther's Bedeutung zur Fortschritt der Auslegungskunst."
3 W. Eichrodt, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, I, p. 1.
4 *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, p. 68, lines 5-10.
5 *Ibid.*, p. 68, lines 33-34.
6 F. Delitzsch, *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch*, p. 219.

sacrifices, performance of liturgies, and the like. It is the myth and ritual, the sacrifices, the consultations of omens, the incantations and purifications which the gods demand, and it is these things which constitute the service of the gods. At the same time, the cult included far more of human activity than it does among us. It is of course inseparable from government, and much of it is *directly* concerned with the preservation and protection of the state.[7] Medicine, business, war, law —all have appropriate religious ceremonies in which these aspects of culture acknowledge their indebtedness to the gods, and in which they receive divine help in carrying out their functions. In short, Babylonian religion and culture was the liturgist's paradise, with prescribed rituals for almost anything from curing toothache to re-covering a kettle-drum. No wonder, since these were regarded important and necessary, that the priesthood was always a very powerful faction to be reckoned with in Babylonian culture.[8] But it was still heathen! Though all of life was thoroughly colored and determined by religious ideas and practices, to an extent which is only a fond dream or a sad memory to modern Christendom, it was lacking in the most elementary facts of true godly faith in comparison with biblical religion. It was thoroughly sacramental, but lacking in the prophetic. It was intensely religious, but lacking in the ethical. It produced great art, architecture, and even perhaps literature, but relatively little nobility or greatness of character.

Over against this sort of religion, biblical faith represents a sharp and radical mutation. The exact nature of that mutation is still a matter of sharp controversy among Old Testament scholars today, but it can hardly be doubted that a very important part of that break with the past lies in the nature of the service of God. Here the results of modern Old Testament criticism come to aid us, for so long as the Pentateuch in its present form was regarded as the work of Moses, it was impossible to avoid the conclusion that Old Testament faith was also predominantly a matter of cultus, of the sacrificial ritual, and the observance of festivals: that the service of God consisted essentially of the performance of the correct rituals at the correct times and places by the right persons, as worship has been defined even for the

7 *Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man*, p. 200.
8 *Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. III, p. 208.

Christian church in recent times. On the other hand, we know that a large part of the sacrificial ritual as described in the Priestly code was borrowed after the Conquest, most likely from Canaanite practice, or inherited from pre-Mosaic times.[9] We have the seemingly clear position of the prophets that sacrifice was not characteristic of the earliest Israelite religion.[10] We have, in the earliest portions of the Bible, amazingly little reference to cultic ritual and practice, but rather an emphasis on the historical acts of Yahweh in behalf of his people, with spontaneous expression of thanksgiving in response, such as the Song of Miriam and the Song of Deborah. "In the places of drawing water, there shall they rehearse the righteous acts of Yahweh."[11] Cultic rituals doubtless existed, but the conclusion seems inescapable that they did not assume great importance until later times.

Here we must come to grips with the central problem with which we are dealing: What is the nature of the act of worship? It is now taken for granted that the purpose of the church is the worship of God, and the starting point for most discussions of worship is that which is actually done in church on Sunday morning. This is good linguistic method, but poor theology, for the startling fact is that on the basis of biblical usage there is very little authority for calling a church ritual worship of God. Underhill defines worship as "a contemplation to procure the love of God."[12] Von Huegel: "The first or central act of religion is adoration, sense of God, his otherness though nearness. . . ."[13] Will: "The expression of religious experiences and aspirations of the individual which takes place by means of intermediary phenomena and which are increased by uniting themselves with those of the religious group."[14] Reed: "Worship is not an abstraction; it is a solemn transaction. It is faith in action."[15] Most of this is solemn nonsense from the point of view of biblical usage. The characteristics, most frequently mentioned in recent times, of what is called worship

9 R. Dussaud, *Les origines cananéennes du sacrifice israelite.* Cf. the judgment of Martin Noth, *Geschichte Israels,* p. 86 f.: ". . . es ist Kaum ein Zufall, dass das AT . . . auffallend wenig Interesse für rein kultische Vorgänge und Fragen zeigt."

10 Jer. 7:22-23; Amos 5:25.

11 Jud. 5:11.

12 *Worship,* p. 18.

13 von Huegel, *Selected Letters,* p. 261.

14 R. Will, *Le Culte,* Vol. I, page reference not now available.

15 L. Reed, *The Lutheran Liturgy,* p. 1.

are also far removed from biblical usage, and can hardly be derived from anything else than modern secular culture. The characteristics of objectivity, beauty, and dignity so dear to the liturgical movement,[16] are all strongly questioned by secular culture,[17] and as a result people who do not wish to give them up try to preserve them by enshrining them in the cultus, and call them criteria for the judgment of cultic values.

When we turn to the Bible we find that worship is something quite different from that of which the liturgical movement speaks. Our English word is etymologically very close to the biblical concept, coming as it does from the old English "weorth" plus "ship," and defined in the *Oxford English Dictionary* as "reverence or veneration paid to a being or power regarded as supernatural or divine; the action or practice of displaying this by appropriate acts, rites, or ceremonies." The biblical term most frequently translated thus can be traced back with very little change in meaning to the Old Canaanite language of the time of the patriarchs. The Hebrew *hishtahᵃweh* means, not an abstraction, as English "worship" does, but rather a symbolic action of specific nature. It is essentially the response to *power,* and is a symbolic acknowledgment of the authority and rule of the person or god thus worshiped. Its sequel is the obedience of slave to master, which in the Old Testament is of course obedience to Law. Here we must anticipate to point out *why* the New Testament gives no justification for use of the term worship to the New Testament church cultus: both the master-slave relationship and its expression in terms of Law are superseded in New Testament faith, as the Reformation church well ought to know.[18] The work of the Reformation is always incomplete, and is being undone whenever the concept of liturgical worship is at the forefront of church life. When worship is the starting point, the line of development in thinking is inevitably from cultus (or liturgy) to hierarchical control, canon law, and hierarchical power with consequent wealth and corruption. Worship is the response to *power,* and tends to produce power.

16 *Ibid.,* p. 1.

17 For an excellent description of the problem of objectivity in historiography see Wilson, *Burden of Egypt* (Chicago, 1951), p. 4.

18 John 15:15; Rom. 8:15. Contrast the statement of Simone Weil, a French Roman Catholic writer, in *L'Enraeiment,* in which she reproaches the Roman Church with teaching that men's relation to God is that of slaves to a master.

Christian faith is the response to *love,* and tends to produce love. I believe it is for some such reason that St. Paul only once uses the corresponding New Testament term, *proskuneo,*[19] and then not of the Christian church, but of a pagan who by the act acknowledges the presence of *God* in the church.[20]

The symbolic action denoted by the Old Testament Hebrew term consists of kneeling before the god or person having power, and then leaning forward until the face rests on the ground, or sometimes becoming completely prostrate.[21] Sometimes the act is completed and acknowledged by the god's or king's placing his foot on the head or neck of the worshiper. The symbolisms should not be difficult to understand. The situation is that typified by a captive of war. The man has been rendered powerless by superior power, and henceforth his fate is completely in the hands of the mighty one. He is in a state of absolute dependence upon the will of the victor, and this is the first basic significance of the act. In the hope of appealing to the mercy of the victor, the captive assumes a position which illustrates his absolute lack of power, and also indicates his complete submission to the victor, the second element in true worship. The third element of the symbolic action is a result of submission: the actual acceptance of the will of the victor as his own, though the reality of this third is often to be questioned.[22] The usual fate of a captive in war was either death, especially if a man of military age, or a lifetime as a slave. Worship is the symbolic acceptance of such slavery, the acknowledgment that he can no longer assert his own will against that of his captor.

19 I Cor. 14:25.

20 It has been observed already that St. Paul is here taking over the prophecies of II Isaiah (45:14), and obviously expects continuous fulfillment of that which the second Isaiah predicted would be true of the coming era. It surely cannot be merely coincidence that only here, in a quotation from the OT, does St. Paul use the term, "worship." Even in this case it is not an activity of the church as such, but the initial act of submission to God whereby the pagan ceases to be pagan!

21 Arthur Weigall, *Ancient Egyptian Works of Art,* p. 160, offers a reproduction from the time of the New Empire in Egypt, showing Asiatics bringing tribute to the Pharaoh. Here are illustrated both the symbolic gesture of worship and the "lifting up of the hands" as a gesture of prayer. The connection between worship and tribute is of course obvious. It is the "service" of tribute which makes the worship real.

22 This whole complex of thought is well illustrated in the Assyrian Royal Inscriptions, for example, in Sargon II's account of his eighth campaign, translated in Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia,* paragraph 148, p. 76 f.

This situation, which is probably the type situation from which the symbolic action arose, is then transferred to other relationships of less immediacy. It is used, for example, as a matter of court ritual whenever anyone comes into the presence of the king, and most of the occurrences of the word in Samuel and Kings refer to such court protocol, but the meaning behind the symbol is still there. The same action is used even in much weaker experiences, and becomes a sort of social gesture to be used merely to indicate respect and willingness to be of service to one, usually in superior social status. Thus Jacob worships Esau seven times upon coming to meet him—he had good reason for feeling dependent upon Esau's mercy, and expressing submission and obedience. On the other hand, Joseph's dream in which the sun, moon, and stars bow down to him indicated far more to his brothers than a mere social convention: "Shalt thou indeed be king over us, shalt thou bear rule over us!" Thus also in Isaac's blessing of Jacob, and in the blessing of Judah, where to worship is equivalent to being ruled.[23] The worship of God is also an acknowledgment of the kingdom of God, but often carries along with it the mistaken idea that the kingdom of God is based on temporal power, which is of course present, though not characteristic in the Old Testament, and which is rejected by the whole of Jesus' teachings and crucifixion in the New Testament. The theme of response to power is shown in a few typical examples: Gideon worships at the edge of the Midianite camp upon hearing that Yahweh has given the host into his hand. David worships upon his deathbed upon hearing that Yahweh has made Solomon king; he worships in his palace at the news that Yahweh has taken his first child by Bathsheba, in accordance with the prophetic word. Balaam, Eliezer, Abraham, and Lot worship in response to actions which are interpreted as the actions of God, usually characterized by power. So also Joshua near Jericho, when he sees the angel who predicts and promises the fall of Jericho.

There is another important fact about these responses to God's power: in all the symbolic acts of worship mentioned above, there is no connection with cult ritual or cult shrine. They are immediate, spontaneous, and non-liturgical. For worship is essentially the expression of a subjective, a purely subjective, response to objective experience,

23 Gen. 27:29, 49:8.

and in early religious faith of both Old and New Testaments, there was no idea that the actions of God could be confined to cultic rituals and ceremonies. To this position of biblical faith must be contrasted the idea of a German pastor, Goltzen, in *Ways of Worship:* "The church is opposed to any such transfer of the real encounter into history, into transcendence, or into ethics. She firmly maintains that, according to his promise, the Lord himself gives his effective presence in the proclamation of the active Word, and in the sacramental activities of the church, for the salvation of the believer and the judgment of the wicked."[24]

It is here that the unexamined presuppositions of the liturgical movement become most apparent. True as it is that the Lord gives the promise of his presence in Word and sacraments, there is no justification for *restricting* the activity of God to the ecclesiastical cultus. It presupposes that God does not act in human life outside the cult, thus secularizing all non-ecclesiastical life. It has meaning only when connected with the claim to infallibility in the Roman Church, for where the cultus itself has such exclusive significance it must inevitably be elevated to a practical infallibility. Finally, such a position is a denial of the whole of biblical history, in which the cultus is rejected in favor of the actual confrontation of God in history. Furthermore, such a position fails to see that human experience, even in cultus, is only a portion of history itself, and a statement of that sort again has meaning only on the assumption that the cultus is itself beyond history—in short, the Latin idea of the re-presentation of a supernatural, heavenly, reality.[25] Finally, it must be realized that the tendency of all heresy is to place limits on the activity of God, usually for the purpose of defending a particular ecclesiastical or theological position. Thus Judaism claimed to have within Torah the absolute, complete, and final revelation of the will of God, which God himself studied for two hours each day, and rejected the historical acts of God in the incarnation, crucifixion, and resurrection. No such artificial distinction between cult and history is justified by the New Testament. It is from cultus to history that the prophets of the Old Testament appealed. Since being confronted with Yahweh in the sacrificial ritual was not accompanied by the results of any

24 *Ways of Worship*, p. 97.
25 J. Danielou, *Bible et Liturgie*, p. 26.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

real confrontation—repentance, justice, love, and mercy—the prophets correctly predicted a confrontation with God in history itself. The fact is that the church cannot guarantee or cause those changes in human life which alone indicate the indwelling Spirit of God.[26] The church can only carry out the function for which it exists: the preaching of the Gospel, the Good News of what God has done and continues to do in human history and experience, that is, in society and in the individual. It is not responsible for results; it is responsible for doing its task. The results are in the hands of God, who works through the church, to be sure, but also when and where it pleases him, whether on the road to Damascus, in a German forest, Mt. Carmel, a Babylonian refugee camp, or a Greek jail.

The greatest danger in such a position lies, however, in the tendency to identify an essentially symbolic action with reality. To turn again to the original action of worship in the Old Testament, we find that the symbolic action can never be only a meaningless custom, carried out for the sake of policy with no real intention on the part of the worshiper to be submissive and obedient. There is not a single case of worship in the Old Testament which was done merely in order to gain an advantage or performed with obvious insincerity. It is possible that such worship is always dismissed as worship of other gods, for the economic foundation of baal-worship has often been pointed out. Even in Canaanite literature the case is no different. In the Ras Shamra texts, Anat elaborately bows down to and worships El, the head of the Canaanite pantheon, but in a later interview, she displays a most unsubmissive and disobedient attitude: "With the might of my long hand, I'll verily smash thy pate, Make thy gray hair flow with blood, The gray hair of thy beard with gore."[27] Such a threat from her was calculated to persuade El to grant her request. It is probably significant that in neither passage where this threat occurs, is the interview preceded by the formal act of worship. So far I have been unable to find a clear passage of *deliberately* deceptive worship in all of ancient oriental literature. Likewise, today I believe we may assume that most acts of worship are done with sincere intentions. There obviously is not too much

26 Cf. the statement of Luther, "the church brings no one to Christ; Christ brings men to the church."

27 *ANET*, pp. 137, 140.

to be gained in the way of non-religious goods from going through the liturgy. That act, then, symbolizes the obedience of man to God—if we insist on calling it worship, for language itself is a set of symbols. Man, by his act, becomes the servant of the sovereign majesty of God, and therefore must serve: but what is the service which God requires? The symbolic act which signifies his intention to serve? Thus we see that worship and service are not the same thing, and cannot be the same thing, unless we reduce religion to an endless round in which the symbol expresses the reality, and the reality is the expression of the symbol. The term "worship service" is a religious and linguistic monstrosity.

The present use of the terms "liturgy" and "service" in referring to the cultus of the Christian church has almost no justification in the New Testament. It has often been mentioned that the New Testament does not prescribe any order of worship, probably for the good reasons already mentioned. Worship is not the purpose for which the church exists. In order to understand why these terms are used, we again have to turn to the Old Testament. Both *latreia* and *leiturgia* are used in the Septuagint to translate the Hebrew *'abodah*. The word expresses, as we might expect, the work of a slave. It is frequently used to refer to the bondage in Egypt from which God freed the Hebrews. It is also, however, very frequently used to refer to the temple or tabernacle cultus, but only in the Priestly Code, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Ezekiel. Of course, there are frequent references in pre-exilic writings to "serving" God. Especially in Deuteronomic writings worship, serve, follow, obey are verbs which follow one another in frequent repetition. Again in Samuel we find reference to fearing Yahweh, serving, hearkening to his voice, and not rebelling against the commandment of Yahweh.

We return to the theme of mutation from ancient Oriental heathenism: service in pre-exilic Israel was essentially obedience to the revelation of the will of God such as the Decalogue. Only after the attempted reconstruction of the past in the period after the Return from Exile is there such an overwhelming interest in the service of the temple with its liturgies, paraphernalia, and the like.[28] These things, of course, ex-

28 It is worth pointing out that there seem to be a number of parallels between the contemporary liturgical movement and the period following the return from Exile. These include the increased emphasis on the power of the priesthood, the attempt to return to the past (which,

isted before; but so long as the prophetic spirit was alive, there was continual protest against over-confidence and too close an identification of the ritual with the will of God. Likewise in the New Testament, when *latreia* and *leitourgia* refer clearly to a cultic act, it is nearly always either heathen or Old Testament cult which is intended. Some uses are so colorless, such generalities that it is impossible to determine whether they refer to cult or not; probably they merely reflect the linguistic usage of the Septuagint.[29] Nothing can be clearer than the fact that the tremendous emphasis on liturgical cultus was not characteristic of early Old Testament faith, or of early New Testament faith. The service of God in the Old Testament is primarily obedience to divine commands, and those are to a large extent secular from the modern point of view, such as the Covenant Code. The service of God in the New Testament is the conscientious exercise of one's vocation. It is in this sense alone that the term service includes the preaching of the Gospel, for the service of the apostle is precisely the declaration of the Gospel of God.[30] But the service of the apostle or teacher is not the service of the layman. In the biblical use of the term there can be no "common service" other than that of Christian love. The slave serves his master as though he were serving Christ. The members of Christ serve one another through love. The churches of Greece serve the church in Jerusalem by ministering to their carnal needs. But for a justification of the idea of a congregation's service of God through a liturgy we must go to the Priestly Code and similar writings.

St. Paul's own description of service in Acts is highly significant. It is the only elaboration, in general terms, of the meaning of service of God in the entire Bible.

> But this I confess unto thee, that after the Way which they call a sect, so serve I the God of our fathers, believing all things which are according to the law,

however, began before the destruction of Jerusalem), deliberate archaism in language which can already be seen in Deuteronomy, and great concern with the minutiae of "correct" cultus, best illustrated by the book of Leviticus, resulting in a woeful lack of perspective and "common sense." It is necessary to point out that both ancient and modern liturgical movements are characterized by deep religious fervor. More than sincerity is needed: the man who threw a bucket of gasoline on a burning automobile was very sincere in his belief that the bucket contained water.

29 Acts 13:2. Cf. also Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch,* article *latreia,* in which the conclusion is also reached that "service" means the whole of the Christian life.

30 Rom. 15:16.

and which are written in the prophets; having hope toward God, which these also themselves look for, that there shall be a resurrection both of the just and unjust. Herein I also exercise myself to have a conscience void of offence toward God and men always.[31]

Here service has to do with the most profound motivations of human life, together with life itself in harmony with these divine motivations. Again, in Romans 12, the reference to the presentation of our bodies as a living sacrifice, our spiritual service, is followed by the description of what is characteristic of that service: "And be not fashioned according to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God." It must be the entire life, not a liturgy, which is service of God. When Strawley says, "The word (*leitourgia*) itself is used in a more figurative sense of good works and acts of charity," we must evaluate that statement as turning truth upside down because of an ecclesiastical act of faith instead of an acceptance of the clear teaching of Scripture. The *basic* meaning of service can be a ritual only in paganism, and perhaps in the priestly writings of post-exilic Judaism.

All this evidence is clear enough proof of the fact that, to quote Goltzen again, "For the Lutheran Church the Scriptures are not a principle for constructing the service but a criterion."[33] In other words, there is no need and no command to attempt the reconstruction of the specific practices and procedures of the New Testament, for any such archaism is self-defeating, resting on a presupposition that God reigned with the completion of the canon. However, to the Lutheran Church the Scriptures are a criterion for judgment which must be taken seriously. This leads us to a consideration of the relation between the Bible and the great tradition of liturgy on which our practice is based. We have already seen that to call cultus the service of God is true only with respect to the action of the minister, not of the congregation, and consequently any overemphasis on the cultus is likely to give a highly misleading impression in a time like ours which is characterized by the most unbelievable religious illiteracy. It cannot be strongly enough

31 Acts 24:14-16.
32 *The Shape of the Liturgy.*
33 *Ibid.*, p. 80.

emphasized that any movement which makes a sharp separation between the sacred cultus and everyday life is religious schizophrenia. Any movement which takes away the primacy of the preaching of the Gospel (as St. Paul uses the phrase) must find its apologia in Babylonian culture, not in the Scriptures of the Christian church.[34]

As soon as we approach the problem of showing what the relation between the Bible and worship is and should be, we find ourselves faced with the actual task of interpretation of Scripture. It is in this task that disagreements come, divisions arise, and denominations go their separate ways. In the Lutheran Church no individual interpretation of the Scriptures is binding, nor is any interpretation of a church committee. What I shall attempt to do is to show what has actually been the use of Scripture in the formation of the great tradition, to suggest ways in which the Protestant church protests, and finally to describe a few principles of the use of Scripture which are generally accepted by most of the denominations today.

There can be no doubt that typology and allegory are the foundation of the early Patristic biblical interpretation and also of the Mass. This method of interpretation was again borrowed from secular Greek writers, who by this means avoided some of the crassness of the Homeric poems which seemed so shocking to later "civilized" Greeks. It is of course closely related to Greek philosophical ideas, especially Platonic. J. Danielou says in *Bible et Liturgie* (pp. 10-11):

> Thus sacramental typology is only a form of typology in general, of the theological analogy between the great moments of sacred history. But in the case of the sacraments, there is a new problem which arises. Actually the sacraments have a double aspect. There is on the one hand the reality which is accomplished. And this reality is in the continuity of the works of God in the two Testaments. But there is also the visible sign, water, bread, oil, baptism, meal, unction, by means of which the action of God operates. There is, so to speak, the sign, the sacramental

34 Cf. Luther on the necessity of clearly teaching the content of the Gospel, *Deutsche Messe*, Holman Edition, VI, p. 176. "Otherwise things will remain as they have been, a daily going to church and a coming away again. For no one thinks that it makes any difference except for the time it takes. No one expects to learn anything there. . . ." Also in his essay, *Von Ordenung Gottis Diensts ynn der Gemeyne, ibid.*, p. 60: "Now in order to do away with these misuses, it is necessary to know, first of all, that the Christian congregation never should assemble unless God's Word is preached and prayer is made, no matter for how brief a time this may be. . . . Therefore where God's Word is not preached, it is better that one neither sing nor read, nor even come together. . . ."

symbol. How should this sign be interpreted? Does it have simply the natural meaning of the element or of the gesture which it uses: the water washes, the bread nourishes, the oil heals? Or is there rather a particular significance? It is here that recent studies on the history of liturgical origins can render service. They have established in fact that it is not possible to seek the origin of Christian sacraments in the Hellenistic world, as has been done some fifty years ago, but that they are directly related to the liturgy of Judaism. Consequently we must seek to find what was the meaning of the signs utilized in the liturgy of Judaism for the Jews of the time of Christ and for Christ himself. Now it is clear that the spirit of the Jews and that of Christ were entirely modeled after the Old Testament. Consequently it is in the meaning for the Old Testament of the different elements used in the sacraments that we have the best chance of finding what they meant for Christ and the apostles. We will then have a typology which will have to do not only with the content of the sacraments, but also with their form, and which will show us that it is correctly that we see them figured in the Old Testament, for it is for this reason that they were chosen by Christ.

What has happened in the transition from Scripture to liturgy is the transition from history to mythology, the latter word always used in this paper with the meaning assigned the word by Kerenyi, "The timeless pattern to which life conforms itself."[35] It is not the Scripture which needs de-mythologizing, but the liturgy. The essence of myths in the ancient world is precisely that supra-historical, timeless pattern, usually dualistic, which became characteristic of the Roman attitude toward the sacraments. In contrast to the biblical message that God had actually revealed himself in historical events and experiences, the liturgical approach of the early church, and also of the modern movement, emphasized, rather, that same timeless, supra-historical reality which became present through the sacraments themselves. To the present day the sacraments are regarded as the means through which "the incarnation and the redemption become actually present,"[36] to quote a spokesman of the Roman Church. Again, an Anglican theologian likes to think of the crucifixion and resurrection as a timeless pattern which becomes characteristic of all life. Theodore of Mopsuestia regarded the sacraments as a ritual imitation of the historical actions of Christ. To us it is absurd when he carries through consistently the idea that every aspect of the liturgy is an imitation of Christ's act: even the offering is

35 In his book, *The Gods of the Greeks.*
36 Van der Leeuw, in *Ways of Worship.*

Christ going to Golgotha, and the deacons who carry the plates are the Roman soldiers who are going to crucify him![37] Again, according to the early Church Fathers, the liturgical acts are the prolongation of the great works of God in the Old and New Testaments. But the relation between those acts and the liturgy is the purely accidental one of external similarity: the Israelites pass through the Red Sea, the candidate passes through baptism, and so on through the whole sorry list. There is no justification for regarding the acts of God as limited to the rituals of the church; nor is there any justification in the New Testament for regarding imitation of Christ as a *liturgical* obligation.

Perhaps the best illustration of the way in which ignorance of the meaning of the Old Testament avenges itself is to be found in the typological interpretation of Old Testament sacrifice, which is of course the foundation of the Roman view of the Eucharist. We have already pointed out that the sacrificial ritual was borrowed, but reinterpreted. There is no reason to believe that the official religion of the Old Testament ever lent credence to the idea that the mere performance of the sacrifice conveyed forgiveness of sins to the sacrificer. It is seriously doubtful that the earliest Old Testament sacrifice even had any connection with forgiveness. It must be remembered that the slaughter of any animal for food was always a religious ceremony involving sacrifice until the Reform of Josiah in 623 B.C. secularized it in the interest of centralization of control over religious ceremonies and the abolition of pagan uses. Meat in the diet of ancient man was doubtless much rarer than it is today, and the enjoyment of a highly prized food was thus connected with the most important festivals of religious life. For this reason religious festivals were never mere acts of duty, but spontaneous and joyful occasions. As late as the second or third centuries of our era rabbis jocularly recommended that young men celebrate the feast of Purim so enthusiastically that (thanks to the effect of wine) they could no longer distinguish between "Blessed be Mordecai" and "Cursed be Haman"! There was never any problem in getting people out to a religious fesival, as Amos specifically states:

> Come to Bethel and transgress; to Gilgal, and multiply transgression; and bring your sacrifices every morning, and your tithes every three days; and offer

37 Cited by Danielou, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

a sacrifice of thanksgiving of that which is leavened; and proclaim freewill-offerings and publish them; for this pleaseth you, O ye children of Israel, saith the Lord Yahweh.[38]

It is not so much the pleasant cult itself which Amos condemned as its complete dissociation from those things which were the unique and characteristic services of Yahweh in contrast to pagan gods, who had little or no concern with justice and righteousness.[39]

But there is yet a deeper reason for the prophetic condemnation. The sacrifice was not only the offering by burning of a part of the animal. The rest of the animal, after also giving the priest his portion, was eaten by the group in a common meal which was simply accepted as a communion between the group and God. The sacrifices in Leviticus which are thus disposed of are also accompanied by bread and oil and sometimes libations of wine, which means that it was a complete meal according to Oriental standards. As late as the third century of our era a temple to Adonis in Dura-Europus on the Euphrates River gives clear witness to this custom and idea by its very design. On one side of the main sanctuary there were discovered a number of smaller rooms opening into the sanctuary or court with its altars. The use of the small chambers was obscure until an inscription was found which revealed that one particular room had been dedicated by a wealthy man for his and his heirs' use forever. After the sacrificial ritual they would retire to this room for the common meal in the presence of their god, who had already received his portion spiritualized by fire. Such a presence of the god would also mean the benefits which he, pleased with this service, would bestow upon the worshipers.[40]

This view of sacrifice, which seems quite generally accepted today, reveals clearly that sacrifice is not primarily a gift to the god in ques-

38 Amos 4:4-5.

39 This seems to be the position of the prophets, but on the other hand it cannot be doubted by the modern scholar that Frankfort is correct when he says: "The reasons which prompted the god's choice [of a king] are sometimes indicated and they are quite surprising; they betray a concern with the welfare of the people for which the theological tenets we are considering do not provide a basis. If the living faith of the Mesopotamians comprised a feeling of utter dependence upon the gods, it also sustained the conviction that the gods had decreed justice as the foundation of society." *Kingship and the Gods,* p. 239.

40 *Excavations at Dura Europos,* Report of the Seventh and Eighth Seasons (New Haven, 1939), pp. 156, 157.

tion, but a sacramental communion with that god.[41] Contrary to a basic principle of traditional liturgics, the sacrifice was a sacrament—the visible sign of the invisible presence of God. There is no foundation in all of ancient religious thought for the sharp distinction between sacrifice and sacrament which we try to draw. This is again clearly indicated in the various passages of the Psalms where prayer, which we still define as communion with God, is regarded as a perfectly possible and even desirable substitution for sacrifice. The sacramental grace of God, to Old Testament faith, was not bound by the performance of a traditional ritual: "Let my prayer be set forth before thee as incense, and the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice!"[42] Prayer itself can thus be just as pleasing to God, just as effective a means of communion, as the slaughter and eating of an animal. This is spiritual religion—divorced from material means—but neither Old nor New Testament faith regard such purely spiritual religion as normal. For the dualistic contempt for material things is not consistent with faith in God as Creator, and so the sacrament as a means of God's self-revelation to man through a material veil has an important place in both Testaments. In neither case, however, can the sacrament be divorced from the Word. In the Old Testament, sacrifice without knowledge of Torah brings only condemnation; in the New Testament, too, the sacraments are inseparable from the Gospel; in fact, the Gospel is itself repeatedly called a *mysterium* or sacrament, for the action of God through the preaching of the Word is in the final analysis just as mysterious and indefinable as is the action of God in the sacraments. The connection between the Eucharist and Old Testament sacrifice cannot be severed, but such a reinterpretation of Old Testament sacrifice emphasizes anew the impossibility of regarding the Eucharist as man's gift to God. Rather, it is another form through which God reveals himself to man in addition to the Word, not in antithesis to it. Again, it is

41 R. Smith, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites,* p. 265. W. Eichrodt, *Theologie des Alten Testamentes,* I, pp. 72 ff. This is, of course, not to deny that other concepts also entered the picture, for which see Eichrodt's discussion.

42 Ps. 141:2. That this is not a late, sophisticated, and "spiritualized" concept is shown by the fact that it is to be found in the earliest ancient religious literatures; for example, the early Sumerian epic, "The Death of Gilgamesh," contains the line, "Utu (the sun-god) accepted his tears as an offering." *ANET,* p. 48, lines 34-35. The texts recovered so far date from the first half of the second millenium B.C., but the content may be as much as a thousand years earlier.

no supra-historical re-presentation of heavenly reality, but an earthly, material means like earthly, human language which God can and does use for his purposes.[43]

The Lutheran Church has a healthy respect for tradition but refuses, at least in theory, to canonize it. Scripture is supposed to be the final criterion of judgment in matters of faith and practice. Above all, such should be true in liturgical usages, but the problem of interpretation already noted comes in continually to vex us. It has been impossible to point out the very far-reaching effects of typological and allegorical interpretation of the liturgical tradition, largely because such effects have been recognized by their theological fruits and thus excised. However, the results of a general religious attitude, alien to the Lutheran Church, are, I believe, to be found in the liturgy even deeper than those words, phrases, and actions which have been expurgated. We have simply not taken seriously enough the difference in the interpretation of Scripture between the Lutheran and the Roman and Greek traditions. Our use of the Bible in the liturgy is similar to the place of the Word in the Orthodox Church. As Florovsky says, "Unfortunately these rubrics are very seldom followed, except in the monasteries. But the mind and the intention of the church are expressed in the rule and not in the fact of its neglect."[44] He does not see the fact

43 One must wonder why the doctrine of the Real Presence has been so closely identified with the sacrament in view of the fact that the "*Word* became flesh." Have we taken too much for granted that the message of the church is Christ? The doctrine of the Word, and the actual experience of the church makes it necessary to emphasize the fact that the presence of Christ is just as much a characteristic of the Word as of the sacrament. The problem is more complex, admittedly, because of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit; the writer would suggest that religious experience cannot be confined within the Procrustes bed of Aristotelian logic even when it is handled by theologians. He would only insist that the current emphasis on the sacramental tends toward too great a claim for one aspect of "communication" at the expense, in actual practice, of the other. Whether we like it or not, both language and the sacraments are symbols or symbolic actions. The modern objection to the term "symbol" with reference to the sacraments is based on a modern, rationalistic definition of the word which simply does not apply to ancient patterns of thought. The dichotomy of Word and sacrament, or to put it in other language, of thought and ritual action, also took place with unfortunate results in ancient Babylonian religion, where the antinomy became disastrous. There it was a division between the so-called "wisdom" and sacramentalism, which became magic. The term "wisdom" is a misnomer, however, for "teaching" or "instruction" would be a much more accurate rendering. Cf. von Soden, "Religion und Sittlichkeit . . ." in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft,* 1935, pp. 155 ff.

44 In *Ways of Worship.*

that in history the use is the rule, the rule or "ideal" in religious life merely becoming enshrined in a liturgical reminiscence.

Here, then, are some specific illustrations of the gap between our principles of the interpretation and use of Scripture and our practice in liturgy: If the clear teaching of the New Testament concerning the function of the church be taken seriously, as it ought, then the preaching and teaching of the Gospel, not "worship," is our task. This should make it perfectly clear to us that communication, not "communion," is the function of the church, for this communion is an activity of God himself which the church cannot produce, control, or prevent. The church can teach and preach the Gospel, as St. Paul did, in every possible way. This communication must then take priority over all other claims in the development of the church's agenda when gathered in the presence of God. No sentimental attachment to "Holy Tradition," catholic or protestant, Gregorian chant, ecclesiastical uniformity, or what liturgiologists call beauty and dignity can be permitted to become a speaking with tongues which mean nothing to the hearers. St. Paul has rather short words for those who insist on being unintelligible in the church; it may be communion with God, but if it does not communicate they should keep silence.[45] The whole Bible is a monument to this principle, for nearly all of it is in the common, everyday language of the writer, not in an artificial or archaic language of the Holy Spirit. The prophets spoke in the most common language, not hesitating to use very earthy, and even what we might consider obscene, language in order to make perfectly clear what they had to say. The language of Jeremiah shows the same linguistic characteristics and similar style as that of the army sergeant who wrote the Lachish letters.[46] Even the book of Deuteronomy shows the same contemporary

45 I Cor. 14:28. Cf. Luther's interpretation in "Von Ordenung . . ." *loc. cit.*, "Thereupon the preacher, or whoever has been appointed, shall come forward and expound a part of the same lesson so that all the others understand it, learn, and are admonished. The first of these Paul, in I Cor. 14, calls speaking with tongues. The other he calls expounding or prophesying, or speaking with the sense or understanding. And if this does not occur, the congregation is not benefited by the lesson, as has been the case until now in cloisters and other religious foundations where they have only wasted their breath against the walls."

46 Cf. W. F. Albright, in *BASOR* 73:20-21, for a discussion of the relationship between the language of the Lachish letters and that of the Bible. To be sure, the book of Deuteronomy shows many deliberate archaisms, but this only reinforces the position taken here: that archaism is one of the most frequent means taken in religion to ensure *authority*, and consequently to en-

language of everyday conversation. Religion was a serious enough concern that it did not have to be dressed up in beauty and dignity to make its impact on human beings—and in the process of being itself, it created beauty and dignity which we can barely appreciate. As Ruskin says of Sir Philip Sidney's metrical translation of the Psalms:

> Sir Philip Sidney will use any cowboy's or tinker's words, if only they help him to say precisely in English what David said in Hebrew; impressed the while himself so vividly by the majesty of the thought itself, that no tinker's language can lower it or vulgarise it in his mind.[47]

It is only when a religion is dying, when it has lost faith and confidence, when it is insecure and timid, that it feels it must protect itself from outside influences by judging everything, not by principle and its own basic function, but by its own ecclesiastical heritage. It is in Babylon that the religious language is non-contemporary, a specialized thing, either the long dead sacred language of Sumerian, or the archaic hymnal-epic dialect of Babylonian. To be sure, the poetry of the Old Testament tends to make limited use of archaisms, but that is characteristic of an art form, not of a religious faith, and there is no reason to believe that any religious value was attached to archaism. Antiquity, beauty, dignity, and objectivity are all values which derive from secular sources and are values secondary to the primary function of the church. It is only a relic of unregenerate heathenism which can place greater value on antiquity, beauty, and dignity of expression than on clearness and accuracy. That cultural values have a place in the life

sure the binding nature of that which is presented as ancient. Authority is necessary to *law*, and the Book of Deuteronomy was presented as the program for a reformation on the basis of law. It is probably for this reason that the Deuteronomic reform was not accepted enthusiastically by the prophet Jeremiah. Cf. Goltzen, *op. cit.*, p. 98: "Only those things which have been received and handed on through generations will have authority." For this reason the writer believes the transition from liturgical religion to "legalistic" religion to be inevitable if the natural course of the movement continues uninterrupted. That canon law may be useful and desirable for the preservation and promotion of a religious group cannot be denied, but that is not the question facing us in the liturgical movement. What we must answer is the question which faced Luther: "Is this Christianity?"

47 *Bibliotheca Pastorum,* quoted by Prothero, *The Psalms in Human Life,* Everyman's Library, p. 129.

of the church cannot be doubted—in fact, they cannot be excluded—but they must not interfere with or hinder communication.[48]

The whole of the liturgy should be re-examined in the light of the teaching of Scripture, to determine how effective is its presentation of the Gospel. Several questions at once arise. First, nearly every class in liturgics is faced with the problem of deciding what is the actual meaning of specific portions of the liturgy! If the liturgy has the purpose of communicating, should it be so difficult to determine whether portions of it are addressed to God or to the congregation? In view of Reed's claim that the best minds of the church have thought deeply concerning the liturgy,[49] it would seem that they ought to have come to some agreement in these matters. On the contrary, it must be admitted that the liturgy was not constructed; it grew, and any such growth is inevitably going to include much that was "started as a makeshift and continued through an oversight," such as the Collect or the Greek words in the Roman Good Friday liturgy.[50]

The second question concerns the use of the Bible. The use of Ps. 124:8 is in flagrant violation of the most elementary principle of biblical interpretation agreed upon by the World Council of Churches Study Department—that all Scripture passages should be used in their context.[51] "Our help is in the name of the Lord" has nothing to do with

48 Compare the denial of the so-called school of "modern" art that art is communication (Sheldon Cheney, *A Primer of Modern Art*) with the probably apocryphal retort of a Roman Catholic priest when it was suggested that he instruct parishioners in the meaning of the liturgy: "What's the use of having the Mass in Latin, if you're going to teach them what it means?"

49 *Op. cit.*, Chapter I.

50 An extreme example of this sort of thing is to be found in the work, *Peregrinatio ad loca sancta* by the Spanish nun Aetheria, end of 4th century, discussed by Wellesz, *Eastern Elements in Western Chant*, p. 19: Aetheria writes that the bishop addressed the congregation during Holy Week in the Church of the Anastasis at Jerusalem. As only the Greek language could be used, not only for the homilies but also for the lessons, and as many people understood only Syriac or Latin, it was customary for the presbyter to translate the words of the bishop into Syriac. The lessons were also translated into Latin by those who spoke Greek and Latin. This report of the pilgrim Aetheria affords valuable evidence of an old tradition of combining Greek and Latin texts, a tradition still maintained today, when Greek words are sung in the Roman Church during the Adoratio Crucis on Good Friday." The preservation of past custom long after it has ceased to have any meaning has long been characteristic of religion, and especially liturgical cultus; the opposite tendency is characteristic of the prophets, Jesus, and the Reformation.

51 "Guiding Principles for the Interpretation of the Bible," in *The Ecumenical Review*, Autumn, 1949, pp. 81-86.

the forgiveness of sins; it refers to divine aid against powerful human enemies. This is medieval exegesis. The selection of many Gospel, Epistle, and Old Testament lessons are obviously directed by a similar type of exegesis, and even Luther had little use for the selections which we are still asked to regard as sacrosanct.[52]

The third question concerns the very structure of the liturgy. In the Babylonian New Year's festival the king must undergo a most humiliating liturgical confession, in which he is deposed from his kingship, slapped, and otherwise thoroughly humbled (liturgically of course) before he is regarded as liturgically pure enough to participate in the rest of the week's liturgical exercises.[53] This whole complex of thought, characteristic of heathen religion, according to which a ritual purification must take place before approaching the holy, is in most striking contrast to the New Testament message that while we were yet in our sins, Christ died for us. Yet in our liturgy it is the heathen and not the Christian pattern which we follow. The central message of the New Testament is the forgiveness of sins, yet it has been reduced to what must by the vast majority be regarded as only a sort of preliminary opening exercise.

Any liturgy is a combination of religion and culture. The service of the church properly makes use of culture in order to convey, to the people living in it, what is the message of God to them. It follows that cultural borrowing on the part of the church is both inevitable and necessary so long as the church is alive. Not to borrow contemporary art, music, language, and architecture, when it can be used, is to be-

52 Contrast Reed, *op. cit.*, pp. 275, 427, and especially the statement, "Their content, however, gives ample evidence of theological insight and liturgical skill . . ." with Luther's statement, *Formula Missae,* Holman Ed. VI, 86-87: "But something seems to be needed, since those parts of the Epistles of Paul in which faith is taught are rarely read, but most frequently those parts dealing with morals and exhortations. While the originator of the Epistles seems to have been a singularly unlearned and superstitious friend of works, the office required that, for the greater part, those sections in which faith in Christ is taught be appointed." Perhaps Reed's position is explained by his rather amazing statement (*at least for a Lutheran!*): "The Epistle is the word of Christian Law . . ." (p. 276).

53 *ANET,* p. 334. Frankfort's comment (*Kingship and the Gods*) on this passage is illuminating: "What is the meaning of this painful scene? It is clear that by his penance and confession the king cleared himself of the taint of past sins and thus became fit to officiate in the succeeding rites." In Christianity confession is the *result,* not the prerequisite, of confrontation with God. e.g., Isaiah 6.

come a fossil which cannot speak to living people.[54] In the past, such borrowing was a matter of course. Luther's hymns used secular folk-tunes. The super-ecclesiastical Gregorian chant may have originated from the popular folk-tunes of Palestine and Syria.[55] The madonna and child came from Egypt, the Chi-Rho originated from the Egyptian sign for "life," and so on down the line. We are embarrassed by all these facts only because we are unable to see the tremendous power of the early church which could borrow right and left to speak to the heathen of its time. As John Wilson says concerning Egypt: "It is only when a culture has worked out a certain degree of its own salvation that it may borrow forms of expression from others. When a later people has attained a definite attitude toward its gods, it may borrow hymns and ceremonies from an older people. . . . But the essential beliefs, ideas, and attitudes of a culture are factors of self-discovery rather than of inheritance."[56]

In conclusion, we must remind ourselves that the function of the church is the preaching of the Gospel—its service through those called and ordained to that vocation, no matter where it is carried out! The service of its members is obedience to Christ, who, in the Sermon on the Mount seems to have required something more than church attendance on Sunday. The service of Christians is carrying out their vocation as though it were done for Christ alone, whether it be a slave serving his master, or an apostle serving his Master.

I believe it is Whitehead who made a statement some twenty years

54 The same is true of any aspect of civilization, not only religion. It is insecurity and fear which makes such borrowing impossible.

55 Wellesz, *op. cit.*

56 Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 316. More immediately relevant to the tendencies of the liturgical movement, however, is the similar movement in the later days of Egypt of the seventh century when the "spiritual emptiness" of the day tried to find compensation in slavish imitation of ancient models in art. "After all, the model came from the revered past, so that it might have magical value, even though it no longer had meaning." Wilson, *Ibid.*, p. 296. Also during the Empire, there was an increasing emphasis on form and a devotion to ritualistic performance "as the continued and familiar activity of hands and mouths which had been denied creative freedom of their own." *Ibid.*, p. 304. Perhaps we have here the tragedy of periods of decline in religion and civilization alike. Precisely at the times when unusually difficult problems are faced, we tend to find the stifling of creativity which might, by the grace of God, result in at least a partial solution to the problem. It is at just such times that the instinct for self-preservation urges irresistibly toward the "return to the past" in the pathetic belief that the problems of the present can be solved by imitating the forms of a glorious past.

ago to the effect that "the religion which wins the future will be that which is best able to show some relation between the Eternal and the common routine of daily life." The service of the church is the proclamation of that Lord who has promised to be with his own, not in a liturgy, but *always* even unto the end of the age.

# The Cause of Sin

By T. A. Kantonen

NOTHING is more obvious than the fact of sin, and nothing is more difficult than to account for it without compromising either the responsibility of man or the absolute goodness and sovereignty of God. Through the ages theologians have debated "the mystery of iniquity" with much the same result as the devils in *Paradise Lost* who sat on a hillside and argued about similar problems "and found no end in wandering mazes lost." Yet the problem cannot be laid aside, for it is no mere academic issue but involves our whole existence. Today it is more imperious and poignant than ever. To cite a concrete instance, an East German town was badly destroyed in the war. Then the Russians came and raped every woman in the town. The following year a flood washed away all the crops. An old resident, a life-long Christian, confronted Bishop Dibelius with the question: How can we any longer believe that the world is ruled by a good God when such things happen? Aside from the flood, which represents natural evil, the burden of the question concerns moral evil, sin, and its place in the divine government of the world. When the destructive fury of man's cruelty and lust thus strains faith to the breaking point, no neat and simple answer will suffice. It is sheer mockery to treat sin lightly as an insubstantial shadow which serves only to bring out more clearly the fundamental goodness of the structure of life, or as a vestige of man's sub-human ancestry, which is destined to disappear as he makes further progress upward. Instead of leaving sin behind in the course of his scientific and technological progress, man seems only to have matured in his sinfulness. To describe modern man's conduct as bestial may well be called a slander on the beasts. On the other hand, to take sin seriously and to place the full responsibility for it upon man himself leaves us with a gloomy outlook indeed. If the evil in human nature is as ineradicable as history shows it to be, what assurance is there that the results of man's progressive manipulation of physical nature may not be ever more destructive, perhaps even fatal? And if man's evil deeds have their source and rein-

forcement in a demonic power which at least thus far has successfully defied God, is not the situation utterly hopeless? What happens under these conditions to the belief in an omnipotent and good God who is the Creator and Preserver of all that exists?

Such, in their present setting, are the questions which the Reformers faced in Article XIX of the Augsburg Confession. They summarized their answer in these words: "Of the Cause of Sin, they teach, that although God doth create and preserve nature, yet the cause of sin is the will of the wicked, that is, of the devil and ungodly men; which will, unaided of God, turns itself from God, as Christ says: 'When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own.' " Let us first observe the historical background of this statement, then analyze its content, and finally, in the spirit of the Confession and in the light of Scripture, develop the given answer in the direction of a constructive solution.

## I. The Historical Background

The occasion for this article is indicated by the context in which it appears in the Confession. It follows and supplements the article dealing with free will. It does not deal with the problem of the origin of sin as such but only with the practical religious issue of man's responsibility for his sin in spite of the enslaved condition of his will. Article XVIII acknowledges that man has a certain freedom in "things subject to reason" but emphasizes man's natural inability to love God or to do his will and makes salvation totally dependent on the work of the Holy Spirit. Statements similar in nature but still more monergistic in expression had been made earlier by the Reformers. Their opponents had been quick to point out that this line of reasoning leads ultimately to the conclusion that God is the cause of sin. If man is by nature a sinner and God is the Creator and Preserver of nature, then the responsibility for sin must be shifted from man to God. Thus Thomas Münzer had written to Luther in 1524: "You make yourself plainly an arch-devil by proving from Isaiah that God is the cause of sin. That is what you have succeeded in doing with your fantastic speculation following your Augustine. Certainly a blasphemous doctrine of free will, treating man with contempt."[1] In his controversy with Erasmus in *De*

1 Gustav Plitt, *Einleitung in die Augustana*, II, p. 424. Quoted in W. D. Allbeck, *Studies in the Lutheran Confessions*, p. 110.

*Servo Arbitrio* Luther had further exposed himself to this attack with his vehement insistence on divine sovereignty and man's lack of freedom. Some of Luther's associates, such as Linck, Brenz, and Bugenhagen, had boldly drawn from these premises the same predestinarian conclusion which was later to characterize Calvinism. According to Linck, "Regarding those that have not been chosen nothing helps, even if St. Peter and all angels should preach."[2] On the specific issue of the relation of God's sovereignty to man's sin Luther had stopped just short of ascribing to God the authorship of sin. Without trying to explain away the fact that it was God who hardened the heart of Pharaoh, the Reformer had stressed the goodness of the divine will and our ignorance of the mysterious ways in which it works. In Luther's own words, written in 1525, "God has forbidden sin and does not will it. This has been revealed and is necessary to know. But how God can ordain sin over a man, this we shall not know, because he has not revealed it."[3] Such cases as the hardening of Pharaoh's heart are part of "God's masquerade under which he hides himself and reigns so wonderfully in the world."[4]

Melanchthon's teaching had been less guarded. A New Testament passage similar to the case of Pharaoh is Romans 1:24: "Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness. . . ." In his *Annotations on Romans* Melanchthon had interpreted this passage as follows: "The opinion is certain that all things are done by God, both good and evil, not only permissively but properly, as the adultery of David, etc. Accordingly the betrayal of Judas no less than the call of Paul is his proper work." Eck made this statement in one of his theses against the Reformers, adding simply: "that is, God wills sins."[5]

Once the issue has been so clearly defined, it was impossible to avoid it. Melanchthon meets it in the article before us by doing "an about-face from his former position."[6] Clearly the central purpose of this article is to deny unequivocally that the will of God is responsible for the existence of sin. In shifting the responsibility from the will of

2 Quoted in J. L. Neve, *Introduction to Lutheran Symbolics,* p. 277.
3 *Ibid.,* p. 279.
4 *Ibid.*
5 Allbeck, *op. cit.,* p. 110.
6 *Ibid.*

the Creator to that of created beings, the devil and godless men, while simultaneously acknowledging God as the source and sustainer of all existence, Melanchthon shows his willingness to join Luther in leaving unanswered the ultimate question of the existence of sin in God's world. That this half-way solution had achieved its immediate purpose is evident from the fact that in the *Apology* Melanchthon has no further need to take up this issue, for the adversaries had been conciliated.

## II. Content of the Article

In turning now to a closer analysis of this confessional statement, we observe that it contains certain indispensable premises from which all evangelical thinking on the origin of sin must proceed. The first of these is the absoluteness of God as the one and only Creator. All Reformation theology, whether it issues from Wittenberg or from Geneva, resolutely rejects every variety of metaphysical dualism and pluralism. It affirms with Paul: "Of him, and through him, and to him are all things" (Romans 11:36). Here this major premise appears in the words "God doth create and preserve nature." In the Formula of Concord, where the Flacian controversy compelled the use of definite metaphysical terms, the affirmation of ultimate monism takes this form: "the devil can create no substance, but can only, in an accidental way, God permitting, corrupt a substance created by God."[7] The true first cause of everything that exists can be none other than God, for he alone has the power to create and sustain. In accounting for the existence of sin, this position leads to severe difficulty, but from first to last the theology of the Confessions refuses to take the easy way out by infringing upon the sovereignty of the Creator. Its keynote remains the unconditioned monism so clearly sounded by Luther: God "works everything in everyone, even in the ungodly, in that he alone with his omnipotent moving power sets in motion, drives, and carries with him all that he alone has created. This power the created one cannot escape or change, but must necessarily follow and obey, each according to the measure of his power, given of God. Thus even all the ungodly cooperate with him."[8]

7 *Epitome*, I, p. 13.
8 WA, XVIII, p. 753.

It is significant that the Confessions uniformly condemn Manicheism, the classical attempt to introduce metaphysical dualism into Christian theology. Thus when Flacius, in Manichean fashion, identified sin with human nature as such, the Formula of Concord inferred that this could mean only one thing, namely, that God as the author of human nature is also the author of sin. No realm of being exists independently of God. A God relieved of the burden of responsibility for anything that truly exists ceases to be the one and only God and has to share his divinity with another power. Hence the original impulse of evangelical faith in grappling with the cause of sin was the same as that of Hebrew prophecy when in the midst of the tragedy of the Exile it was tempted to resort to Zoroastrian dualism. It speaks the language of Deutero-Isaiah: "I am the Lord, and there is none else. I form the light and create darkness; I make peace and create evil; I the Lord do all these things" (Isaiah 45:6-7).

The second basic premise is the reality of sin. This is the thought behind the connecting words "although—yet." Although God creates and preserves nature, yet the existence of wickedness in the world he has made and governs is a fact which cannot be explained away. While the Confession stresses the absoluteness of God, it avoids the extreme to which such an emphasis has often led, the reduction of sin to an illusion. Thus the jealousy with which rabbinic Judaism guarded the conception of the one God and the vigor with which it attacked Gnostic dualism culminated in Maimonides who denied the positive existence of evil. Such is the background of Spinoza's pantheism in which evil is only "darkness in us," our failure to grasp things *sub specie aeternitatis*. Christian thought too has time and again resorted to the same expedient, especially when theological monism has been reinforced with idealistic metaphysics. Augustine, with all his profound insight into the nature of sin, nevertheless betrays his Neoplatonic orientation by conceiving of all evil, in the final analysis, as a privation or defect lacking in genuine reality. "Whatever is, is good."[9] To Leibnitz sin is imperfection which necessarily inheres in the finite forms of existence in order to manifest the perfection of the whole. Hegel and Royce give the same answer when they insist that if we could see life as a whole,

9 *Conf.*, VII, p. 18.

we would not have the apparent disproportion which marks our vision of things in their temporal order. The *reductio ad absurdum* of the illusionistic hypothesis is seen in so-called Christian Science. This type of reasoning is utterly incompatible with the spirit of the Confessions. Sin is too stark and terrible a reality to be reduced to a distortion in a point of view. If sin is an illusion, so is the redemptive work of Christ, which is the heart of the evangelical faith. It is worth noting that while the numerous references to Augustine show how eagerly the Reformers sought his support, they carefully avoided the Neoplatonic aspect of his thought.

The third basic affirmation is the goodness of God. If God is absolute and sin is real, then the logical conclusion, as Eck and others had pointed out, is that God is the cause of sin. But this conclusion the Reformers are not willing to accept. The refutation of it is the central purpose of the article before us, and the Formula of Concord repeats with emphasis: God is not the cause of sin. If the sovereignty of God cannot be impugned, neither can his goodness. It is better to admit a logical paradox than to swerve from the conviction: "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" The paradox is softened when the confessional teaching is interpreted in the light of Luther's distinction between *Deus absconditus* and *Deus revelatus*. The mystery of iniquity may then be relegated to the terrifying hidden majesty of the absolute God whose ways are past finding out, while the God revealed in Christ is seen to be "an abyss of love." From the moral point of view the idea that God creates sin cannot long be tolerated. Thus even the Reformed Church, whose great leaders Zwingli and Calvin had both taught supralapsarian predestination, according to which God decreed the fall into sin, proceeded in the Synod of Dort to repudiate this doctrine and to confine predestination to a race already fallen. The motive for this action finds witty expression in the remark made by a Dutchman named Robbert Robbertz in answering some supralapsarians at the Synod: "When the first sin was committed, Adam put the blame on the woman, and the woman put the blame on the serpent. The serpent, who was as yet young and callow, made no answer. Now that he has become old and confident he comes to the Synod of Dort and says that God has done it."[10]

10 N. Söderblom, *The Nature of Revelation*, p. 67.

Although everything else be uncertain, faith, as Whittier saw, clings to its "one fixed stake": "I know that God is good." If the will of God is the cause of sin, then, morally speaking, either God is not good or sin is not sin. It appears to be fully as important to preserve unimpaired the content of the divine will as love as it is to insist upon absoluteness as its formal aspect. A God capable of sin is not a God worthy of worship. If, on the other hand, a place is found for sin in the holy purpose of God, then sin tends to lose its meaning as opposition to God and becomes instead an instrument for good. There is, of course, an important element of truth in Leibnitz's idea of "felix culpa," echoed in Faber's lines "Greater good because of evil, larger mercy through the fall." The Cross is the supreme exhibition of the divine alchemy which Joseph had seen at work: "Ye thought evil against me, but God meant it unto good." But God's power to make constructive use of existing wickedness does not necessarily make him the author of that wickedness. It only reveals his opposition to sin in glorious triumph.

It is to defend the goodness of God that the words "unaided of God" are inserted into the statement "which will, unaided of God, turns itself from God." Separated from its context the expression *non adjuvante Deo* lends itself to the interpretation that God is, at least indirectly, the cause of sin. It is he who first turns away from his creatures, leaving them easy prey to the temptation to turn away from him. This interpretation seems to derive support from the wording of the German text, "so Gott die Hand abgetan," when God withdrew his hand. To construe the phrase in this way, however, contradicts the basic thought of the article. As Loy points out, "it would be an argument in favor of the fundamental error which it was the purpose of the article to renounce and condemn."[11] The true meaning is simply that God has no hand in the decision to sin and gives no aid to the rebellion against his will. Sin is opposition to God, and his attitude toward it can be nothing else than counter-opposition. That this was the thought which Melanchthon himself sought to convey is revealed in his substitution in the Variata of the words *contra mandata Dei,* against the commandments of God, for the equivocal phrase *non adjuvante Deo.* If any indirect meaning is to be read into the disputed words, it would be more in keep-

11 M. Loy, *The Augsburg Confession,* p. 857.

ing with the sense of the Confession to see in them a reference to the active goodness, not the indifference, of God. In affirming that it is a will unaided of God which turns to sin, the Confession points implicitly to him whose will it is to save sinners and to that end offers to them the almighty aid of his grace.

In the fourth place, the Confession affirms that sin, from the outset, is a *volitional* reality. "The curse of sin is the will of the wicked . . . which will . . . turns itself from God." Here Melanchthon's language is clearly that of Augustinian voluntarism. Augustine traced the possibility of sin to the mutability of created beings. Creation was *ex nihilo* and sin, the return to the original nothingness, is due to the "falling away" of the will of the creature from the immutable will of the Creator. Sin thus originates in volitional activity, but it is the activity of man's will, not God's. In creating mutable finite wills God is responsible only for the possibility of sin, not for sin itself. The possibility inherent in mutability becomes sin through man's misuse of his God-given freedom.

This is the argumentation that the Reformers adopt to escape the conclusion that God is the cause of sin. It enables them to maintain at the same time both the absolute sovereignty and goodness of God on the one hand, and the reality of man's sin and his responsibility for it on the other. God is indeed the Creator of all nature, including human nature, but a distinction must be made between nature as created by God and nature as perverted by the will of the wicked. The Formula of Concord makes this distinction more explicit: "Thus it is also well to note the diverse signification of the word 'nature,' whereby the Manicheans cover their error and lead astray many simple men. For sometimes it means the essence of man, as when it is said: God created human nature. But at other times it means the disposition and the vicious quality of a thing, which inheres in the nature or essence, as when it is said: The nature of the serpent is to bite, and the nature and disposition of man is to sin, and is sin; here the word *nature* does not mean the substance of man, but something that inheres in the nature or substance."[12] Expressing themselves in this scholastic language, the authors of the Formula do not hesitate to apply to sin the term "acci-

12 *Epitome*, I, p. 12.

dent" as distinguished from "substance," *i.e.*, human nature as created by God. To use a physical analogy, an apple may become rotten, and yet not rottenness but only the possibility of rottenness belongs to the nature of the apple. Just so the quality or disposition which inheres in human nature but is not constitutive of it is the Augustinian mutability which renders the human will capable of turning away from God and thus precipitating the accident of sin. In creating man to be free God could not deny him the possibility of wrong choice. To question the Creator's purpose in granting this possibility is to question the value of existence on the human level.

The doctrine of the volitional origin of sin has important implications. It makes sin inseparable from guilt. If sin has its source in the core of personal existence, the activity of the will, and not in the body or any other aspect of the external world, then man cannot escape his responsibility by allocating his sin to any kind of impersonal necessity. Sin is always wrong decision for which men as persons are responsible. The Formula of Concord quotes with approval Luther's description of original sin as *personal* sin. A consistent adherence to this point of view precludes the use of the idea of original sin as a defense mechanism, as can easily happen when sin is traced by an inescapable biological necessity to a corrupt Adamic nature. Over against a false atomism, original sin calls attention to the organic solidarity of the race, to the fact that sinful lives throughout human history are interlocked to form a collective "kingdom of evil." In Ritschl's words, "sin is in each the work of all and in all the work of each." Human existence, even in its sinful state, is responsible existence, and the attempt to shrink from bearing the burden of the race is only a sign of immature or superficial conscience.

The volitional nature of sin points finally to the salvability of the sinner. This is the deepest significance of the confessional distinction between substance and accident. In modern terms, sin is perversion of function. God does not save sin but he gives a new alignment and a new direction to the perverted will. As Luther expressed it, "It is not God's will through the Gospel to uproot nature, but to let remain what is natural and to direct it onto the right track."[13]

13 *EA*, XXXIV, p. 250.

The fifth affirmation is the reality of the demonic will. In tracing the origin of sin to the will of the wicked, the Confession mentions first the devil and then ungodly men. While positing both the sovereignty of God and the responsibility of man, it thus introduces a third factor, a superhuman evil will. The Confession adheres to the scriptural teaching which points beyond man to a personal demonic power opposed to God and seeking to lure man to similar opposition. Man's will is only the secondary cause of sin, for his sin is the result of temptation, while the deeper cause lies in the tempter. In sinning, man identifies his will with an evil will already in existence. There is also a difference in the way in which sin is generated in the two wills. The combination of finiteness and freedom which characterizes man's will disposes it to evil when an external stimulus prompts it to expand beyond its bounds, while the tempter's will represents spontaneous and deliberate evil choice from the beginning. This characterization of the will of the devil which constitutes it as the final known source of sin is based on the word of Jesus in John 8:44, "He was a murderer from the beginning, and has nothing to do with the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks according to his own nature, for he is a liar and the father of lies."

Farther than that the Confession does not go. It is content to leave the last word both on God and on the powers opposed to him to the Revealer who alone can speak with authority concerning the transcendent world. To Jesus the existence of the devil as a powerful personal being was a terrible reality. Such considerations as the historical origin of this belief, the channels by which it entered into Jewish thought, and the forms which it assumed in the apocalyptic of his day are here beside the point. The important fact is that Jesus sensed more keenly than anyone else in scriptural revelation the reality of the Adversary and conceived of his whole mission as a conflict with him. Jesus' ministry began with the profound experience in the wilderness where he had to fight off the assaults of the Evil One. His struggle *for* the Kingdom was from the very outset a struggle *against* a superhuman enemy actively opposing him and using men as his tools. When he sowed the good seed of the Word in the hearts of men, he saw the devil going to work at once to sow weeds there (Matt. 13:33 ff.). He saw the world as God's acre, but he also saw growing there plants which

the Heavenly Father had not planted. "An enemy has done this" (Matt. 13:28). He compared himself to one who enters the house of a heavily armed strong man to bind him and to plunder his goods (Matt. 12:24-29). He sought to equip his disciples to trample down the power of the enemy (Luke 11:29), but he also saw the enemy creeping into their midst to sift them like wheat (Luke 22:31). Peter's well-meaning effort to dissuade him from the *via dolorosa* was prompted by Satan, and it was Satan who put it in the heart of Judas to betray him. His arrest was the hour of "the power of darkness" (Luke 22:53), but his death was to be the means by which the "ruler of this world" was to be cast out (John 12:31-33). From beginning to end the reality of the devil is such a fundamental presupposition of Jesus' life-purpose that it becomes an enigma or a delusion unless we hold with the apostolic Church: "The reason the Son of God appeared was to destroy the works of the devil" (I John 3:8). So integral is the idea of the devil to the thought-structure of the New Testament that when it is removed the whole structure totters. From the Christian point of view the problem of sin cannot be simplified to include only God and man. It is as impossible for us as it was for the Reformers to set aside the apostolic word: "We are not contending against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world rulers of this present darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places" (Eph. 6:12).

In speaking about the devil Jesus uses the language of religious faith rather than that of theological analysis. But the unpleasant truth which he teaches cannot be disposed of by resorting to the oft-repeated argument of eighteenth century liberalism that he merely accommodated himself to the crudities of his contemporaries. It is true that the gospels represent Jesus as sharing the popular belief which attributed various illnesses, particularly mental illness, to demons, and their cure to exorcism. But they also make clear that Jesus had a far profounder conception of demonic power. The prevailing demonology was pluralistic. The various demons operated independently of each other, and the exorcist practiced his art by setting one demon against another. Thus the Pharisees claimed that Jesus exorcised demons with the help of a more powerful demon, Beelzebub. To Jesus such an explanation was utterly incoherent. Satan is not divided against himself. Jesus saw him-

self confronted with an organized kingdom of evil ruled by a single autocratic demonic will. Nor did he simply share the current apocalyptical pessimism which abandoned the present world to Satan and projected the Kingdom of God entirely into the future. According to Jesus, the Kingdom was already at hand and the decisive battle with Satan's kingdom had begun. He saw God and his Messiah winning the battle and Satan falling like lightning from heaven (Luke 10:18). His mission was to see God's cause through to triumph. To him the kingdom of evil was not a conundrum to be explained but a power to be overthrown. He never questioned the sovereignty of God or the reality of Satan. Satan exists but he exists to be destroyed. There is no excuse for Satan, no rational or moral ground for his existence. Nor is there any attempt to give Satan a status in ultimate reality, such as metaphysical dualism requires. God alone can create; Satan can only obstruct. His very reality is negative reality. He is meaningful only in being that which God conquers. To the question of whence, in a world created and controlled by an almighty and good God, Satan derived such a nature, there is no other answer than the word quoted in the Confession: "He was a murderer from the beginning. . . . When he lies, he speaks according to his own nature, for he is a liar." This is not a rational explanation of the origin of sin. It will not satisfy a philosopher who persists in seeking a rational ground even for the irrational. Its true significance can be grasped only by an existential thinker such as Kierkegaard, to whom it means: "Sin posits itself." Sin has no antecedent explanation, for no matter how far we push the inquiry, sin is always a factor in its own genesis.

Such, then, is the answer which the Confession gives to the question of the cause of sin. God is the absolute and sovereign Creator of all that exists. Sin is a reality which cannot be explained away. Yet God who is holy love cannot be the cause of sin. Sin makes its appearance as perverse creaturely will which sets itself against the will of the Creator. Man is incited to sin by a superhuman, but not creative or absolute, demonic power in whom the will to sin is spontaneous and deliberate, a power which Christ came to destroy.

The validity of this answer lies in the fact that it preserves the basic insights which revelation affords into the problem without endan-

gering any one of them through undue emphasis upon another. It does not remove the tensions of faith by any easy over-simplification. It recognizes that the tension between God's absoluteness and God's goodness cannot be solved by a simple either-or. Stress upon the absoluteness alone infringes upon God's goodness by making him the author of sin and denies man's responsibility or else reduces sin to an illusion. Stress upon the goodness alone likewise either denies the reality of sin or places a limitation upon God and robs him of his absoluteness. Similar unresolved tensions exist between the will of man and the will of God on the one hand, and between the will of man and the will of the devil on the other. To emphasize God's absolute sovereignty over man is to deprive man of responsibility, but to place upon man the sole responsibility for originating sinful opposition to God either makes him essentially unsalvable or else, if he is to be saved, gives him such superhuman importance that his action determines God's action. Finally, to shift the total responsibility upon the devil exonerates man and tends to absolutize the power of evil. In retaining these tensions the Confession proposes no ultimate solution but it does set up safeguards against any false or superficial solution. In spite of the complexities and difficulties involved, all the relevant factors, God's creative sovereignty, his goodness, man's responsibility, and the reality of the devil, must be given due weight in a theology founded upon revealed truth and true to the faith which lives by it.

## III. Constructive Analysis

Our analysis of the article before us has brought to light some definite aspects of truth but the attempt to relate them to one another has yielded only a series of paradoxes. From the point of view of rational speculation the cause of sin may indeed remain forever an unsolved mystery. Yet it is the duty of theology not only to analyze and define the truths of faith but also to understand more and more clearly their interrelatedness. Hence we cannot escape the questions how the responsibility for the origin of sin can be referred at the same time to the will of godless men and the will of the devil and how either sin or the devil can exist in a world created and preserved by a God who is both omnipotent and good. In the spirit of the Confession and seeking

further light from Scripture, let us then proceed to the constructive portion of our study. Let me suggest that the human, the demonic, and the divine factors constitute three levels of explanation, which we may designate as the empirical, the transcendent, and the ultimate. Each of the first two levels yields a valid explanation within its proper boundaries, but the total answer can be given only on the third level.

On the empirical level we must affirm the confessional teaching that the cause of sin is "the will of the wicked, that is, of ungodly men." Sin is a universal fact of human experience, because every man has brought his own sin into the world. Sin is guilt, and the sinner himself is the guilty one. No matter what explanations beyond the level of individual human experience there may be, it is fundamentally wrong to use them in such a way as to get rid of personal responsibility. Augustine states it well: "With free decision has God created me; if I have sinned, *I* have sinned. . . . It is *I* who have sinned, not Fate, not accident, not Satan because he forced me into it, but I have consented to his transgression."[14] Luther's description of original sin as personal sin guards against a similar danger of using this doctrine as an escape mechanism. A thorough-going analysis of sin never permits us to regard the fall as a mere historical event. It is a profound diagnosis of a universal and perennial human predicament. "Sin came into the world through one man," says Paul, and then hastens to add *"because* all men sinned," not, as Jerome erroneously translated this key passage, *"in whom* all men sinned" (Romans 5:12).

To understand how sin inevitably originates in every human being the best starting point is still Augustine's mutability of the human will. This thought gains added depth with Kierkegaard's insight into anxiety as the presupposition of the act of sinning, an insight strongly supported by modern psychological analysis (Horney, Kunkel). Its most adequate theological expression today is found in Reinhold Niebuhr. Standing at the cross-roads of nature and spirit, of finiteness and freedom, man is involved in a tension from which he cannot extricate himself without sinning. The anxiety itself is not sin; it is indeed the prerequisite of faith as well as of sin. But instead of entrusting himself to God, man hides his inner distress, seeks to achieve security with his

14 *Migne* 57, p. 57.

own means, and begins to play the role of God. It is in refusing to acknowledge his dependence upon God and in pretending to be the master of his fate that man sets his will in sinful rebellion against God. The fact that this self-deception is partly unconscious affords no escape from responsibility, for every feeling of remorse contains the implicit acknowledgment that a contrary choice was possible. Of his own will, without external compulsion, each of us falls into sin. When we face without subterfuge the deepest of our problems, our relation to God, we must own up to our guilt. Empirical analysis of the cause of sin has done its work when we have discovered with Kierkegaard that guilt is "the most concrete expression of existence."[15]

Turning now to the transcendent level of explanation, we must affirm that both Scripture and realistic reflection on human nature and history support the confessional teaching which traces the cause of sin beyond the will of man to the will of the devil. The scriptural evidence already adduced for the reality of the demonic is incontrovertible. This evidence cannot be contradicted by the device, often used, of describing the historical origin and development of Jewish demonology. We may begin with such minor spirits as the *seirim* and the *shedim* or the *nephilim* and the *bene ha Elohim,* indicate the infiltration of Persian and Babylonian ideas, and trace the gradual evolution of an evil power of cosmic significance until a full-fledged Satan is shown to be available to Jesus and the Apostles. This account may be true, but when it is used to deny the existence of the devil it is a perfect illustration of what William James called "the sociologist's fallacy," the irrelevant attempt to invalidate an idea by describing the history of the belief in the idea. The fact remains that the existence of the demonic does not belong to some obscure fringe of the Christian revelation but in its very center. *Nullus diabolus nullus redemptor.* In Brunner's words, "redemption through Jesus Christ cannot be imagined without that dark background of Satanic power."[16]

In denying the existence of Satan modern liberalism has echoed the arguments of Schleiermacher who retained too much of the optimistic world-view of the Enlightenment to deal adequately either with sin or its cause. He claimed not only that Jesus and the Apostles added

15 *Concluding Unscientific Postscript,* p. 470.
16 *The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption,* p. 141.

nothing new to the idea of Satan but that the Christian doctrine of redemption has nothing to do with the idea. Faith in God and in Christ does not require faith in the devil. Furthermore, it was inconceivable to Schleiermacher that a being equipped with such intelligence and knowledge as are attributed to the devil could stubbornly remain evil. Today both the deeper insight into the thought-world of the New Testament afforded by biblical scholarship and the appalling experiences of diabolical wickedness in our century enable us to take more seriously the original Christian affirmation of a superhuman "power of darkness." The Church has never believed in Satan in the same sense in which it believes in Christ, but the more realistically it has understood its mission the more clearly it has seen its warfare to be not against flesh and blood but against principalities and powers, "against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places." Particularly superficial is the thought that sin is incompatible with a high degree of intelligence. The stronger the mental powers and the more pronounced the genius, all the more distinctly the contours of the Antichrist appear in a personality opposed to God.

In present-day theology the idea of the demonic as an explanation of the tragic nature of existence has been recognized most fully by Paul Tillich. The Bible, he points out, contains references again and again to "cosmic powers, the serpent, the beast of chaos, Satan, demonic-angelic figures, the irrational forces of nature" as "partly responsible for the human predicament." And he insists that theology should take seriously the fact that "some of the greatest philosophers (Plato, Origen, Kant, Schelling), in spite of their belief in reason, have been driven to the myth of the transcendent fall."[17] Tillich formulates his own concept of the demonic in terms of a tension between creation and destruction which results in "the relatively independent eruption of the 'abyss' in things."[18] He argues further that "the demonic comes to fulfillment in personality, and personality is the most prominent object of demonic destruction."[19] And since personality stands in social connection, human community too manifests cleavage by powers beyond man's own psychical depth. Following the same line of thought, Allan D.

17 C. W. Kegley and R. W. Bretall, *The Theology of Paul Tillich*, p. 343.
18 *Interpretation of History*, p. 84.
19 *Ibid.*

Galloway insists that the demonic, far from being a curious outmoded belief, stands for "forces which are sub-personal in character yet superhuman in power" which crush the spontaneity and vitality of spirit and reduce life to an impersonal meaninglessness.[20] We may give them new names such as mechanism and determinism but they constitute a genuine and terrifying threat to personality and can be overcome only by Christ.

In affirming the validity of a transcendent explanation of the cause of human sin it is not profitable to go beyond revelation to speculate on the origin of Satan's sin. Christ's word that Satan has been a "murderer from the beginning" must suffice. Philosophically speaking, this is to say with Kant that evil comes from an inexplicable tendency toward evil or with Kierkegaard that sin posits itself. It is indeed quite impossible to formulate any clear doctrine of Satan, for as Brunner observes, "it is of the essence of the power of darkness that it does not reveal itself."[21] It can be both one and many, personal and impersonal, operating now with the "deep guile and great might" of perverted genius and now as soulless natural force, or even appearing as a veritable "angel of life." This insight is contained in our Lord's word that the devil is a "liar and the father of lies." It may indeed be this diabolical deceit that leads men to deny his existence even when, in Goethe's words, "he has them by the throat." The very idea of Satan is treacherous. To take it lightly leads to a dangerous underestimate of the power of evil or else to an equally dangerous overestimate of man who thus refuses to acknowledge himself as victim of temptation and with perverse arrogance assumes sole responsibility for sin. On the other hand, to take it seriously leads either to irresponsibility and fatalism or else to fearful soul-agony and the horrors and injustices of witch-burning. While acknowledging the reality of a superhuman source of temptation, the biblical descriptions "chaos" and "darkness," "murder" and "lie," should warn us against giving too concrete a meaning to what is essentially sheer destructive meaninglessness. The safest course is to follow thinkers like Temple and Aulén and say that the concept becomes meaningful and legitimate only when we think of the devil

20 *The Cosmic Christ*, p. 231.
21 *Op. cit.*, p. 143.

as conquered.[22] The nature of the power of darkness becomes clear only in the light which shines from the victorious Christ. In no case does Satan have an absolute existence alongside of God. In the final analysis, even he is part of God's creation and subject to God's sovereignty.

We come thus to the ulimate level of explanation, to the true first cause of all that exists, God himself. It was a sound impulse that prompted the Reformers in their first statements to speak so boldly of the unconditioned sovereignty of the Creator that their opponents had occasion to accuse them of making God the cause of sin. They were right in formulating a more guarded statement when their position was interpreted as contradicting the goodness of God. But the truth in the original insight persisted when Luther continued to speak of the devil as "God's devil." The apparent contradiction is overcome when we pass beyond the empirical and the transcendent to a truly ultimate level of explanation which allows God to be God. When we define divine goodness empirically, i.e., in terms of moral perfection, God cannot indeed be the cause of sin. But even our highest concept of the morally good is inadequate to define God. He is not just the Moral Governor of the universe. He is the absolute and sovereign Creator whose ends and means no creaturely intelligence can fathom. And his goodness is more than moral perfection. It is holiness. This basic attribute of God, to use the language of Rudolph Otto's classical analysis, connotes a tremendous and fascinating numinosity which remains to creatures an awe-inspiring mystery. It may operate in ways which to us appear to be unclean and even demonic. In Tillich's words, "If the holy is completely identified with the clean, and if the demonic element is completely rejected, then the holy approximates the secular. Moral law replaces the *tremendum* and *fascinosum* of holiness. The holy loses its depth, its mystery, its numinous character."[23] Tillich goes on to say that in contrast to puritanical Calvinism with its "almost neurotic anxiety about the unclean," the theology which stems from Luther retains the divine numinosity. In this light Luther's phrase "God's devil" assumes vital theological importance.

22 W. Temple, *Mens Ceatrix*, pp. 261-292; G. Aulen, *The Faith of the Christian Church*, pp. 205-206.

23 *Systematic Theology*, I, p. 217.

If the sinful and the demonic are genuine realities in God's creation, and if metaphysical dualism is to be rejected, there is no way in which an ultimate explanation can keep these realities completely separate from God. Nor does Scripture attempt to do so. The hardening of Pharaoh's heart by God is not an isolated instance. It is he who puts a lying spirit in the mouth of the prophets to entice Ahab (II Chron. 18:19 ff.). It is he who either directly or through Satan entices David to take a census and then wreaks terrible punishment for the arrogant deed (II Sam. 24, I Chron. 21). When he allows Satan to smite Job, the innocent sufferer "receives evil at the hand of God" (Job 2:10). The greatest of all crimes, the crucifixion of Jesus "by the hands of lawless men," explains Peter, was "according to the definite plan and foreknowledge of God" (Acts 2:23). "God has consigned all men to disobedience," declares Paul (Romans 11:32). In describing "the coming of the lawless one by the activity of Satan," the Apostle accounts for this activity by saying, "God sends upon them a strong delusion to make them believe what is false" (II Thess. 8 ff.). Finally, the author of Revelation, in portraying the beast who lures the kings of the earth to make war on the Lamb, concludes: "For God has put it into their hearts to carry out his purpose by being of one mind and giving over their royal power to the beast, until the words of God be fulfilled" (17:7).

Deutero-Isaiah, then, is not alone in putting into the mouth of God the strange words "I create evil" (Isa. 45:5). This scriptural teaching is incomprehensible when God is viewed in the perspective of unchanging moral law as the righteous judge and ruler of the world. It becomes meaningful only from a purely religious point of view which recognizes the continuing activity of a sovereign God who may create forms of existence having no moral worth and destined only to be destroyed when they have served their purpose in his world-plan. Thus Paul ascribes to Christ the creation of the self-same demonic "principalities and powers" which He came to destroy: "In him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things invisible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through him, and unto him" (Col. 1:16). The status of demonic power in divine providence may be

understood in the light of Paul's description of Satan as "the god of this world" (II Cor. 4:4). The tyranny of Satan in the present evil age is a passing phase of the creative process, preparatory to the new aeon which begins with Christ. Satan's power in the world has been compared to the thick ice which covered the continents during the glacial period, stifling all growth but shaping the earth for new life in the future.[24] So it is also with sin. Redemption is not a divine afterthought. The Lamb has been slain from the foundation of the world. It is the will of the Creator that mankind should travel the tortuous road of sin in order to mature to a full realization of his redemptive goodness. He has "consigned all men to disobedience that he may have mercy upon all" (Romans 11:32). Even the law, which as Luther saw is allied with sin and Satan as one of the "tyrants," performs the "strange work" of aggravating sin and eliciting divine wrath. It too belongs to the preparatory phase of creation and is superseded in Christ. If we fail to see the justice of this divine strategy, Scripture gives only this final answer: God is God who "has mercy upon whomever he wills, and he hardens the heart of whomever he wills. . . . But who are you, a man, to answer back to God? Will what is molded say to its molder, 'Why have you made me thus?' " (Romans 9:18-20).

In conclusion, we must admit that neither the analysis of the Confession nor the attempt to carry the inquiry forward by seeking new light from Scripture has yielded a rational solution of the cause of sin. The human, the demonic, and the divine factors all remain irrefragable and in unresolved tension. Sin is enmity with God, for which man is responsible. But man is too puny to be the author of the rebellion. He was tempted by a superhuman power whose very nature is evil. Thus the true beginning of sin is not in men but in "the devil that deceived them" (Rev. 20:10). The origin of sin in the devil has the same rationally inexplicable spontaneity as the origin of life itself. But above all is the completely unconditioned will of God, the Creator of all reality, including man and the devil. Sin is not the miscarriage of his plan, for his plans do not miscarry. Why he creates and endures "vessels of wrath made for destruction, in order to make known the riches of his glory" (Romans 9:22), we do not understand, "for who has known the

24 T. P. Virkkunen, *Jumalan Valtatiet*, p. 207.

mind of the Lord?" (Romans 11:34). Faith takes its stand upon his revelation of himself as omnipotent and holy love and trusts that even the most inscrutable and terrifying aspects of life ultimately serve the purpose of that love. The intellectual difficulties clinging to this answer lose their sting when we learn to shift our thinking from a man-centered to a God-centered point of view. We cease to measure God's goodness by our own limited conception of goodness. Instead of thinking in terms of our own individual welfare, we seek to envisage with Paul the final destiny which God has in mind for mankind as a whole and to view in this perspective the slavery to "the elemental spirits of the universe" which his children must endure before they are mature enough to enter upon their heritage (Gal. 4:1 ff.). The premises for such thinking are not drawn either from the past history or the present experience of the old aeon in which we live but from the ongoing creativity of God and its consummation in the new aeon of which Christ is Lord.

For faith the problem of sin is not the problem of understanding it but of conquering it. Here revelation gives us a clear and unequivocal answer. Our crucified and risen Lord has won the decisive victory. The Cross unveils both the depth of sin and the depth of the love which overcomes sin by transforming it into an instrument of redemption. The last word on sin can thus be none other than this: "For our sake he made him to be sin who knew no sin, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God" (II Cor. 5:21).

# Notes and Studies

## TOWARD A LUTHERAN VIEW OF CHURCH AND STATE

By George W. Forell, Herman A. Preus, and Jaroslav J. Pelikan

THE church is the company of the Cross. It lives by the Cross, and at times it must live under the Cross as well. This is such a time; this is a generation of martyrdom. And that means a generation for power and witness, for the Holy Spirit and the hope of the Lord's return. The church is the company of the Cross, seeking and then speaking the will of God for the world.

As members of the church, we would find that will of God for the whole of life. As citizens, we would discover its message for the meaning and promise of the American community. We are therefore concerned with learning to know the will and the Word of God for the relation between the church and the state. False views of that relation can thwart the will of God for both the church and the state, and can muffle the Christian's witness to his world. In our own time such views have produced persecution and martyrdom, or, even worse, indifference and despair. If this "heaven-rescued land" is truly to "praise the Power that hath made and preserved us a nation," then the Christians who inhabit it must articulate a view of church-state relations that can take the full measure of the challenges and opportunities of the present hour.

As Lutheran citizens, we turn for our guidance to the resources of our faith and knowledge: to the Holy Scriptures, the source of Christian truth; to the Lutheran Confessions, which face this situation realistically and practically, being born out of the struggle of church and state; to the pronouncements of the Reformer himself, who voiced many profound insights into this question; and to the teaching tradition of the Lutheran Church, which has continued to wrestle with this problem until our own time, when the Communist and Nazi perils called forth a Lutheran literature stained with martyrs' blood. But since the world is in constant flux, the church must continually reexamine her position in the face of new and changing philosophies of government. Surely conditions in both church and state are so desperate today that neither partisan politics nor theological pedantry nor even "the dogmas of the quiet past" (Lincoln) dare let us sit in comfortable discussion, unaware of the millions that have died for the faith in our lifetime and the other millions who are suffering and dying for Christ at this very hour.

It is with the relation of church and state that we are here concerned. That we may all talk about the same thing, we ought to define these two concepts—not in the abstract but in the concrete, as we see both the church and the state in action and living together in one society, outwardly at peace but inwardly in constant

and constantly varying tension. Can they live in perfect peace, or must they live in some such tension? Perhaps a definition of terms will help us to understand these two entities which have lived together so long in a relationship running all the way from identity to separation to open hostility.

## What Is the Church?

In the Apostles' Creed we confess that the church is the communion of saints. It is the fellowship of all those on earth and in heaven who believe in Jesus Christ. It is the people of God of both the Old and the New Testament.

"I will build my church," Jesus said to Peter (Matt. 16:18). The church which he promised to build and which he is now building is no mere outward organization called Lutheran or Roman Catholic or Baptist. It is this same communion of saints, the company of all those who have the forgiveness of sins through faith in the crucified and risen Lord. It is what Paul calls "the body of Christ" in his Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Ephesians, and Colossians. But this spiritual fellowship whose life we share and in which we confess our faith is not what the state confronts, nor altogether what we mean when we are talking about the relation of church and state. For this holy catholic church shows its presence in the world through outward communities of Christians gathered around the Word and the sacraments. To these communities we give the name congregations or churches. Like-minded congregations can band together to form synods or denominations. Though the sum total of these churches does not constitute the communion of saints, nevertheless the only church with which men can operate is this outward community, the organized church.

And so when we speak of church and state, we mean by "church" these organized groups of Christians, worshiping together in churches; living together by the Word and the sacraments; spreading the Gospel of Christ in a lost world; helping men to fulfill their destiny by living for God; building churches, schools, hospitals, homes for the weak, the aged, the homeless, the unfortunate; and going about doing good—all of it inspired by the love of Christ. This is the church as men can see it in action. In the relation of church and state, to be sure, the concept "church" sometimes acquires an even broader definition. The state must often deal with all religious groups, Christian and non-Christian and semi-Christian, and by "church" it designates "the forces of organized religion, led by Christian groups but including also Jews and other bodies of worshipers of God" (Stokes).

## What Is the State?

Now, what do we mean by the state? Though theorists since Plato have supplied us with definitions aplenty, Webster's is adequate for our purposes: "a political body, or body politic; the whole body of people united under one government, whatever may be the form of government." The people, according to this definition, are "united under one government." In other words, the authority and

power to maintain order and peace reposes in the government. And it reposes there not only because of an agreement between government and citizens or a "social contract" (Rousseau), but because government, governmental authority and power, is an institution of God. We get this idea from the Scriptures, whose view of government is perhaps best summarized in Romans 13:1-8.

On the basis of this and other biblical declarations, Luther and the other writers of the Confessions have provided us with the raw material for a complete and workable doctrine of church and state. This is God's world. God the Creator rules the world. "All authority has been given to me in heaven and on earth" (Matt. 28:18), and Christ is King. He is King whether men recognize his kingship or not. Rulers can mock him, disobey him, even persecute his people, but God is in history still, and in his long-range plan for his world all things will serve his ultimate purpose. On this point the prophets of the Old Testament are particularly emphatic. God wants all men to come under his beneficent rule and to share in its blessings now and forever. For this he gave his own Son.

God is working out his will in two realms. As Luther interpreted the Scriptures, there are two divine kingdoms, the kingdom on the right hand and the kingdom on the left hand, a spiritual and a secular kingdom. God rules in both kingdoms by his Word. In the kingdom on the right, he rules his church by the Gospel. In the kingdom on the left, he rules by the Law. And to maintain law and order and peace in the secular kingdom he has instituted secular authority. This is the "authority" or *exousia* that St. Paul described in the verses referred to earlier. He calls upon all men to be "subject to the governing authorities" on the grounds that "there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God." The rule of law, government, secular authority, rulers and magistrates on every level from President Eisenhower to O'Grady pounding a beat—all these somehow exist in the world by divine ordinance. This immediately poses a series of problems for the church and for the Christian citizen who must live in both realms and under both regimes, a member of the church and a member of the state. What is the relation of these two regimes in the world? Where are the limits of their respective authority? What is the proper scope of secular authority and of ecclesiastical authority? Can the two live cooperatively in peace, must they live at swords' points, or should they live in absolute separation?

## Absolute Separation of Church and State?

The first solution to concern us here is the effort to solve church-state relationships by a concept of "absolute separation between church and state": a division of human life into two neatly separated spheres, one the sphere of the state, where the church dare not trespass, and the other the sphere of the church, where the state dare not trespass. We should make clear at the outset that separation of church and state in America does not have the "absolute" connotation that has sometimes been attributed to it. In the United States it has usually meant just the separation of the external ecclesiastical organization from the government. When

the Bill of Rights insists that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," it does not prescribe or prohibit separation of church and state in the rigid and absolute sense in which we shall discuss it here.

Both Christians and non-Christians have sometimes advocated the absolute separation of church and state. Among Christians it was usually the result of utter despair over the sinful world and of the eager hope that the impending return of the Lord would put an end to the abominations of the state. At times it was the expression of almost complete indifference to the problems of politics and social life.

Even among the early Christians there were some who counseled complete separation. Theologically the most significant of these was Tertullian. Himself the son of a Roman army officer, he rejected completely all Christian participation in the affairs of the state and especially all military service. Concerning the former he said: "Having quenched all ardor in the pursuit of glory and honor, we have no fervent desire to take part in your public meetings; nor is anything more entirely foreign to us than the affairs of state." As far as military service was concerned, he insisted: "There is no agreement between the divine and the human oath, the standard of Christ and the standard of the devil, the camp of light and the camp of darkness. One soul cannot be due to two masters—God and Caesar."

The same attitude later appeared in the early monastic attempts to withdraw from the world and thus to practice absolute separation. Eventually many monastic orders did take an entirely different position and became extremely active in politics and the affairs of state, but in the beginning they represented a protest against involvement of the church in the affairs of the state. Ironically, they fled the world —and then conquered it; they separated the church from the state—and then dominated the state.

In post-Reformation times the position advocating absolute separation appeared most consistently among some of the sects. They voiced an absolute refusal to participate in the affairs of the state. They admitted that the Bible *does* teach Christians to "be subject to the governing authorities." But they insisted that this does not mean that they should *become* governing authorities. They meticulously separated the power of the keys and the power of the sword, and wanted no part of the latter.

Through the influence of Pietism, the theory of absolute separation made a considerable impact upon Lutheranism. Pietism in Europe tended to look with suspicion on government and those who participated in it. In America, too, the Pietist and Lutheran patriarch Henry Melchior Muhlenberg did not exactly applaud the political careers of his sons. And to this day Pietistic Lutherans feel that the Christian should tolerate the state as a necessary evil, pay his taxes, and serve in the army, but otherwise should have as little as possible to do with the affairs of the state. To many Lutherans, separation of church and state means as little participation as possible in political affairs.

The absolute separation of church and state has also been advocated on other

grounds than this sort of perfectionism. In nineteenth century Germany there developed the notion of the "autonomy" of the various areas of life and the claim that the laws of one realm could not be transferred to the other. The laws of the church, found in the New Testament, are to govern the Christian individual and the church. The state, however, has its own laws which have to be deduced from its own power structure. The spokesman of this group was Friedrich Naumann. For him the state was merely an instrument of power. He said: "The struggle for survival has taught the nations to be armored animals." And he believed that the Christian must be guided by two entirely different ethical attitudes as citizen and as a disciple of Christ. "Every one of us," he said, "is a servant in many realms, and in those realms must obey an iron compulsion, a logic which is contained in the situation itself. But wherever we are free from such compulsion, wherever we have the feeling that our path is not determined, there is the part of our life where we want to be first of all servants of Christ."

The most important statesman to operate with this type of intellectual separation between church and state was Bismarck. Through him it has received the label "Lutheran," though it is not even a reasonably accurate facsimile of Luther's own concept of the relationship of church and state. It allowed for a *positivistic* and cynically realistic political philosophy entirely unaffected by specifically Christian insights. "Politics is politics" became the slogan of the "realistic" politicians who separated their religious activities very neatly from their activities as bearers of political power. "Absolute separation of church and state" sanctioned a double moral standard, and the Christian ethic was relegated to Sundays, the family, and personal relationships of the individual. The state and its laws were considered to be completely autonomous.

It is of some significance that the totalitarian state has shown considerable favor to those Christian groups which practice and advocate the complete separation of church and state as so far discussed. In Germany the small Protestant sects had very little difficulty with the Nazi state, which at the same time persecuted the territorial churches. In many instances these small sects enjoyed the government's benevolent toleration. The same seems to be true in present-day Russia, where the Baptists have shown a great deal of vitality while most other religious groups have been either exterminated or become mere instruments at the disposal of the state.

It seems that even the "totalitarian state" can temporarily tolerate Christian groups if they limit their activities to personal devotions and small prayer-meetings. The totalitarian state seems to welcome the concept of absolute separation of church and state if it leaves almost all areas of life to the state's complete and exclusive control.

All this would indicate that absolute separation of church and state, though advocated with the best of intentions by sincere Christians all through history, is a counsel of despair. Defensible as long as the church expected the immediate return of the Lord, it ultimately surrenders too much of life to the powers of darkness. Such separation tends to give up the doctrine of creation, that God is Creator

and Lord of both church and state and that his will is law in both realms. Luther felt that Christians were under an obligation to do everything in their power to strengthen the state as an ordinance of God. Though he was convinced that the restrictive and punitive functions of government were not necessary for the Christian and could be dispensed with if all men were Christians, he felt that in a sinful world Christians would fail in their duties to God if they did not do everything in their power to maintain political authority. He said: "You are under obligation to serve and further the sword by whatever means you can, with body, soul, honor, or goods. For it is nothing that you need, but something very useful for the whole world and for your neighbor."

Absolute separation of church and state denies the function of the Christian community to be the salt of the earth and the light shining in darkness. This assumes an interaction between the church and the state as well as the church and all other areas of life, for which the concept of absolute separation has not made adequate provision.

### Church-Rule vs. State-Rule

Much more frequent in Christian history than the several theories of separation between church and state have been various systems in which one dominated the other. These systems have in the past been characteristic of most groups in Christendom, and even now many parts of the world church and of the world political community incline to one or another of them.

1. *Church-Rule.* In Western Christendom the most common way of ordering church-state relations has been the superiority of the church over the state. Accordingly the church has felt obliged to bring the will of God to bear upon the state by preaching and pressure, equating the will of God with the will of the church or, more precisely, the will of those momentarily directing the church. This approach was part of the programs for reform instituted by the leading medieval popes, who also provided it with theological validation. As the only section of the church that declares its undivided allegiance to medieval Christianity, Roman Catholicism has never repudiated this ideal. Indeed, in the "Syllabus of Errors" issued on Dec. 8, 1864, Pope Piux IX reinforced and reinterpreted it in opposition to modern democracy.

Underlying this interpretation is a view of the church as an external institution founded by Christ and perpetuated by the apostles and their legitimate successors. Since all authority in heaven and on earth is vested in Christ and by him vested in the apostles, notably Peter, it follows that there is not only a single basis of all authority in God, but also a single instrument in the institutional church. It is by God that kings reign, but he uses the church to rule the rulers. And over the church there rules Christ's vicar on earth, who is "less than God but more than man" and therefore has a divine responsibility to superintend the political affairs of men and of nations. Reinforced by forgeries like the Donation of Constantine and by the political skill of the medieval papacy, this system elicited the reluctant

obedience of kings and princes. But eventually developments in both the church and the state made such pretensions on the part of the church impossible of realization. In areas of the world like Spain and Latin America the Roman Church has not hesitated to reinstate teachings which, because of the criticism they would evoke, its American subsidiary disavows.

In fairness we must add that Protestantism has not always been averse to making the same boastful claims, and, when circumstances were right, it has been willing to wield the same authority over the common life. Instead of the church it has tended to set up the Bible as the arbiter of public and private morals, believing it to be the source of all reliable knowledge about the Law. Since only the regenerate can understand the Bible, the "rule of the saints" over the commonwealth (Cromwell) has sometimes taken on many features of papal rule, differing from it principally in the locus of authority. During the period of the Reformation there were those who wanted to put the Mosaic code in place of the Saxon law, and numerous Protestant groups still feel obliged to make their interpretation of the Christian ethic legally binding on all citizens (Prohibition). It would seem, therefore, that a religious and theological tradition that has produced Malan should be slow to criticize one that has produced Franco. The authority of the Bible is as subject to perversion as is the authority of the pope.

To evangelical Christianity, church-rule appears as a perverted effort to make a valid point. If those whom our Lord addresses as his disciples are a salt and a light (Matt. 5:13-16), then they are this in the community, not only individually but also corporately. And if this discipleship means a faithful response to his Word that confers knowledge of the truth and freedom (John 8:31-32), then the truth of the Word must have meaning for all men, regardless of whether or not they are members of the church. Much of the resistance to church-rule has unquestionably come from those who refused to acknowledge any lord outside themselves or the state. In opposition to such a declaration of independence from God, it has correctly stressed that the God whom the church worships and whom the Bible proclaims is the Creator of heaven and earth, the Ruler and Judge of all nations, of all men, and therefore of the state.

But in doing so it has too quickly forgotten that the judgment of God hangs over the church as well as over the state. It has also lost sight of the fact that the fallen world is still the creation of God and therefore capable of at least some external conformity to his will and ways, even without the church's help. Paradoxically, this has served to obscure the fact that the morality of the state must always fall short of the requirements of the mind of Christ, which therefore can never become normative for it. In attempting to raise the state to the level of the church, the theory of church-rule has often succeeded only in turning the Gospel into a Law and producing various forms of clerical Fascism.

2. *State-Rule.* While church-rule has been typical of the West, the Christian East has tended to the opposite "Caesaropapist" extreme, domination of the church by the state. In the Byzantine Empire, "the longest and most considerable experi-

ment of a state-church that Christendom has ever seen" (J. B. Bury), state-rule was accorded a theological rationalization as impressive as that which the Western church gave to church-rule. From Byzantium it was exported to Czarist Russia, where its excesses help to account for the anti-clerical bent of nineteenth century nihilism and twentieth century Bolshevism. Erastianism, a factor in the Reformations of England, Germany, and Scandinavia, was a by-form of the same ideal of the national church: a church that not only denied the sovereignty of the foreign pope, but also granted to secular rulers as its "principal members" a disproportionate say in religious affairs. A violent expression of this ideal is the word of Agapetus to Justinian: "God has need of no one; the emperor needs only God. Between the Deity and the emperor there is no intermediary."

At its noblest, state-rule has represented a desire to take seriously the Christian calling of the lay ruler, independent of clerical domination. It is significant that where it has prevailed the church has succeeded best in going beyond a mere adaptation of culture for its purposes to the creation of a Christian lay culture. Criticism of "Byzantinism" by Roman Catholic apologists for church-rule is invalid insofar as it refuses to admit that the institutional church is also subject to the laws of the state and that the state has rights which do not depend upon the church for validation. This is the sound insight behind the oft-abused term "order of creation" for the state. Theoretically, state-rule might look like the application of the universal priesthood of all believers to the problem of church and state—provided that the rulers of the state are believers!

In practice this is exactly the rub. This solution may have been defensible when there were Christian rulers, subject to the proclamation of the Word, the administration of the sacraments, and the discipline of the Christian fellowship. But in the hands of secularized or even pagan rulers, the same system became demonic, as both the German and the Russian churches have learned to their regret. What began as an endeavor to carry out the will of God for the world ended in a totalitarianism where the church had to serve the ends of the state. Such an arrangement is evil regardless of those ends. Wherever it appears, evangelical Christianity must resist it as a fundamental misunderstanding of both church and state and an effort to turn the Law into a kind of Gospel.

Both church-rule and state-rule tend to tyrannize the conscience and to enforce by police power what only the Holy Spirit can enforce. Inquisition and intolerance are almost inevitable under either system; for where the Law and the Gospel are confused in either direction, there both suffer.

### The Interpenetration of Church and State

The point of contact between church and state is given by God. The fact that he is Lord of both precludes absolute separation as well as the one-sided domination of the one over the other. God deals with men through church and state, but he does not act in the same manner through both. The church is primarily the

agency of the Gospel (though it has an obligation to proclaim the Law), the state is primarily an agency of the Law (though it has an obligation to the Gospel).

God the Creator and Saviour deals with men by means of the Law as well as the Gospel. While the Gospel is the good news of redemption through Christ, the Law sets forth the holy will of the Creator for his creation.

God rules the world and therefore he is sovereign in both realms. He wants all men to be saved and to be brought into the truth through faith in his Son, the crucified and risen Lord Jesus Christ. He wants order, peace, love, and a good life for all people (I Tim. 2:1-4). But sin is an active power in the world, everywhere busy trying to thwart the will and the rule of God. Therefore God has established the rule of Law in the world, to keep order and to curb wickedness. God's ultimate desire is still to save men. And he cannot save them by the Law. He can save them only by the Gospel of Jesus Christ and faith in him. It is therefore that Luther calls the Law the "foreign work" of God and the Gospel the "proper work" of God. To save the world and to bring men under the benevolent rule of the Gospel and his love, he planted his church in the midst of the world. It is the body of Christ, Christ living and active in the world. And through Word and sacraments the church is here to bring all men into the kingdom and to proclaim the will of God to the world.

God addresses his Law to men through the many forces and events of nature and history, but one of his principal agencies of Law is the state, ordained "to punish those who do wrong and to praise those who do right" (I Pet. 2:14). By the Law God would primarily arouse men to an awareness of their need of him and their present alienation from him; as Luther emphasized, physical death and the sword of the policeman both remind us of the wrath of God. The Law cannot become the Gospel and the state cannot become the church because the Law is always sent to accuse us and to show us our sin. But like the Law, the state has a second purpose, too, namely, to uphold the world as God's world in spite of sin. As God uses nature and history generally for this purpose, so he employs particularly the ministry of the state to promote and reward civic righteousness and to sustain the kind of world in which the Gospel might be preached.

What are the obligations of the state in relation to this Law of the Creator? They are in the main three. First, political authority expresses the Law in the form of positive laws. It is through the state that the Law confronts us as a reality. And it is the task of the state to define and proclaim the Law as it is "written in the hearts of men." Thus the ideal of the Golden Rule should and frequently does become normative for the statutory law of the state (e.g., speed laws). A second duty is to enforce the laws, and a political authority which neglects this obligation fails in its God-given task. Law without sanctions is not law. Though the Law does not receive its validity from the state, it does receive its force there, and the government must not bear the sword in vain.

And, finally, it is the task of the state to be the protector of the Law. This means more than enforcing laws; it means setting an example. In this sense Luther

could exhort the Christian prince "to apply his whole mind to make himself useful and serviceable to his people and not think, 'Land and people are mine; I will do as I please,' but 'I belong to land and people; I must do what is profitable and good for them.' " Thus a person in political authority is uniquely responsible to God, not only as an individual but as a bearer of political responsibility. For this reason Luther could describe him in the most glowing terms: "Besides the Gospel and the office of the ministry there is no greater treasure on earth than government." "And he who despises government and is disobedient opposes at the same time the true and highest God who speaks and judges through it."

While the state cannot properly proclaim the Gospel, the church, commissioned to announce "the whole counsel of God" (Acts 20:27), proclaims both the Law and the Gospel. When it announces the Law, it does so first of all to itself; for the church lives by the forgiveness of sins, and this presupposes the repentance produced by the Law. The advocates of church-rule forget this when they seek to exempt the church from the strictures of the Law. Having proclaimed the Law to itself, the church goes on to announce it to all men. Thereby the church would evoke that repentance which prepares the way for the Gospel, and this is always the church's primary call and concern. It must address this Law to rulers, too, and for this it must have a greater measure of freedom than the advocates of state-rule would usually grant it. No one is exempt from the Law's accusation, not even the king, and the church must be independent enough to speak the Law to the king for his repentance and the Gospel for his faith.

The secondary function of the Law is to uphold the order of the world, and when the church announces the Law it does so for this purpose too. The proclamation of the Word for the past twenty centuries has helped to sustain marriage and the home, and it has similarly been instrumental in teaching men the true nature of the state. The state becomes guilty of a fundamental misunderstanding of its nature and purpose when it forgets that it is under the sovereignty of God. In a democracy the church has a peculiar opportunity to announce this Law to all who will hear, that citizens might recognize the true nature of the state and its relation to God. It is the irony of totalitarianism that when, in the interests of self-preservation, it forbids the church to preach this Law, it thereby deprives itself of that by which alone it could be preserved.

But when the church identifies its Law with its own special interest or with the special interest of a particular class or nation, the Law becomes propaganda and the church a pressure group. The special problems of the state demand technical competence as well as the illumination of the Law; the church dare not confuse the two, as church-rule does when it spells out in detail the duties of the state in this or that situation. The church is no more obliged to do this when it preaches the Law than it is to select a wife for the man to whom it announces the will of God for the married estate, or to choose a job for the man to whom it explains the doctrine of the calling.

The church's message of forgiveness in the Gospel also has relevance for the

state, not indeed because the state as such can repent and believe but because the Gospel is "the power of God for salvation" (Rom. 1:16), and a power that makes itself operative in all the situations of human life. It is the responsibility of the man in Christ to harness that power not only as a church member but also as a citizen. He has a double status as a citizen of both the church and the state, but he remains one person made alive in the only living God by the one Gospel. An absolute separation of church and state would tend to change this double status into a double standard of morality and thus rob the state of the saving influence of Christian citizens, "blameless and innocent, children of God without blemish in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation, among whom you shine as lights in the world, holding fast the word of life" (Phil. 2:15-16). The believer who trusts in Christ identifies himself with men as Christ did, in obedience to the same Father (Phil. 2:5-8).

As Christ did, he also recognizes that obedience to the Father brings on the Cross. The world being what it is, the life of faith involves men in constant tensions and ambiguities. While an exclusive preoccupation with Law would lead men to demand perfection in their civic choices, and to settle for nothing less, the Gospel teaches them to act within the situations into which God has called them, and to trust God for forgiveness. The life of the Gospel is a life of freedom and courage, of daring to work in the midst of the concrete world of parties and campaigns, caucuses and lobbies. As it proclaims the Word of God, the church warns men of the possibilities for sin operative in that world and at the same time reminds them of the possibilities for service operative there. In this way the church renders the state the highest possible service, producing men who are realistic without being cynical and principled without being quixotic.

## HOW DID JESUS REGARD HIMSELF?

By William C. Berkemeyer

OUR whole attitude and response to the life, work, teaching, and ministry of Jesus will depend upon whether we believe God has acted and come to us in him or no, and to what degree and in what way. One of the perennial questions of the church, from the days of the original apostles to the present, has been, "Who is this Jesus?" The church has answered, "He is Messiah, Suffering Servant, Son of Man, Lord, Son of God"—with all the semantically varied and philosophically different implications of these and other titles.

Scholars and churchmen have not been satisfied with these answers. They have been concerned with the question of Jesus' own self-consciousness, probing to find who he conceived himself to be and whether he imparted that conviction clearly to others. New Testament scholarship is quite at odds in this matter of exactly what Jesus' conviction was.

## I

Let us now face the possibility, which I think is a serious probability, that Jesus never revealed who he was because he was unconcerned about it, and that this may be the ultimate reason for the Markan emphasis upon what has been called the Messianic secret. Is it of any great significance what Jesus thought of himself, whether he was right or wrong in his self-judgment, and whether he was ever concerned to discuss it with his disciples? It is conceivable that he may have been less, in God's sight, than he thought himself to be, or that he may have been more. We believe more, and that this "more" is related to the probability that he was not self-conscious about the matter at all.

If, after one of Jesus' healings or teachings, someone had said to him in derision, "Who do you think you are?" would it have surprised us if some gospel had recorded an answer like this: "My friend, it never occurred to me to ask. I have been too busy doing God's work from day to day, and searching to know just what God's will was for me in the tasks to which he called me."

Obviously, from the record, all of Jesus' work had something to do with the kingdom of God. But was it necessary for Jesus to have identified his exact role in relation to the kingdom, in terms of forerunner, or King, or Son of Man to be, etc.? William Manson thinks it almost inevitable. He writes:

> If Jesus saw the kingdom of God breaking through into history in the signs attending him, he cannot but have been occupied with the question in what relation his own works stood to the predicted coming of the Son of Man. . . . If Jesus saw the kingdom of God to be foreshadowed in his work, he cannot but sooner or later have thought of the Son of Man foreshadowed in himself.[1]

On the other hand, there is much in the teaching of Jesus, as recorded in the Synoptics and in St. Paul's interpretation of Jesus' role (cf. Phil. 2:5 f.), to suggest that the humility of Jesus was such as to make him utterly self-forgetful, even to the extent of neither asking nor answering the question, "Who am I?" His concern for the kingdom and the doing of God's will may have absorbed all his thought and emotion and blotted out or prevented such personal queries as "What is my role? What is to be my fate? What part shall I play? What reward shall I have?" Ernest C. Colwell has well said:

> The supreme tribute to Jesus' own humility is that no one can answer the question: "What did Jesus think of himself?". . . Distinguished scholars are sure that Jesus claimed to be the Messiah. Equally distinguished and competent scholars deny that Jesus claimed to be the Messiah. . . . There is only one inescapable conclusion. This is that Jesus was not concerned to make people know what he was, and the reason is that he was almost completely dominated by the desire to make known to people what the will of God was and what God wanted done. . . .[2]

1 William Manson, *Jesus the Messiah* (Philadelphia, 1946), p. 99.
2 Ernest C. Colwell, *An Approach to the Teaching of Jesus* (Nashville, 1946), pp. 73, 74.

It may well be that all the answers given in the gospels and epistles are the answers of Jesus' followers, both those who were his friends and contemporaries and those who were his post-Resurrection followers.

## II

I have chosen Mark 8:27-9:1, which most scholars agree is composite in source, to focus this problem because the key designation of Jesus, running through it is "Son of Man." The problem is underlined sharply for us if we take the parallel synoptic accounts into consideration (Matt. 16:13-38, Luke 9:18-27). We can follow this striking progression:

Jesus asks: "Who do men say that I, the *Son of Man, am?*" (Matt. 16:13).

After Peter confesses, "You are the Christ" (Mark 8:29), Jesus continues: "*The Son of man* must suffer many things" (Mark 8:31).

Then calling his disciples to take up the cross and follow him, Jesus warns: "Whosoever is ashamed of me and my word, of him will *the Son of man* be ashamed when he comes in his glory" (Luke 9:26).

Finally there comes this pronouncement: "I tell you there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see *the Son of man* coming in his kingdom" (Matt. 16:28).

Do all these uses of "Son of man" mean the same thing? What does Jesus himself mean by the phrase?

## III

New Testament scholars are pretty well agreed that, for the early church and the evangelists themselves, there is no interest in distinguishing meaning or usage and that the title, as applied to Jesus, is already a composite one, suggesting him who they believed was God's Messiah, who had suffered and died upon a Cross and rose again, and who they expected would return in glory to judge and rule the world. As Branscomb puts it: "The early church in its appropriation and development of the Son of Man theology inserted it into the tradition of Jesus' sayings in so many places where one can be sure that it did not stand originally."[3]

It is also agreed that we cannot be sure exactly what the phrase might have meant on Jesus' own lips, if and when he used it, because it could mean a variety of things. The title itself, in Hebrew or Aramaic, might have been either "son of man" or "the Son of man." In one form or the other it could have meant any one or more of a combination of the follwing: (1) "Man" in the generic sense. (2) An indirect, third-person way of referring to oneself, i.e. "this son of man," "this man," "myself." (3) A broad, generalized way of referring to the Messiah, which is what it seems to be for Mark.[4] (4) I who am the Messiah. (5) Man in contrast to God, man the creature, man in his humility.[5] (6) Israel in the composite

3 B. H. Branscomb, *The Gospel of Mark*, Moffatt Commentary, p. 156.

4 C. G. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels* (New York, 1927), Vol. I, p. 70.

5 F. C. Grant, in *The Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. VII (Nashville, 1951), pp. 641, 642.

sense of the righteous remnant and the God-appointed leader.[6] (7) The Second Adam, the heavenly man whom God will send in the last hour to be the Judge of mankind.[7] (8) I who am the Messiah now and will be revealed after my Resurrection as God's coming One.

If Jesus used the term himself, it may have been in any one of these ways. It is even conceivable that he did not always use it in the same way, or in any exact way, or that the meaning he attached to the term changed during the course of his ministry. In any case, it would be difficult for the evangelists to know or to keep such uses apart, especially in the light of the composite meaning associated with their use of "Son of man" and with their lack of interest in providing a day-to-day psychological life-development biography of Jesus.

## IV

Among the fairly firm conclusions of New Testament scholarship are these: (1) "Son of man," whatever it means, is Jesus' favorite self-designation in the Synoptic gospels.[8] It appears most frequently after Peter's confession. It is never used in the narrative or as a title by which Jesus is addressed, but always appears only on the lips of Jesus. (2) In the earlier uses of this phrase in the gospels there are occasions when it most naturally suggests merely "man" or "I."[9] (3) In the later uses there seems to be a variation of emphasis between Q and S passages, the former tending to stress the glorious future aspect, the latter the note of suffering and death.[10]

There is no agreement, however, upon when Jesus used the term and what he meant by it. Conclusions as varied as the following are common: (1) Jesus never used the phrase. It was put on his lips by the church because of its observation of his suffering and resurrection and its hope in his second coming as Judge.[11] (2) Jesus used it and meant by it the coming One, the Judge of the Messianic Age, with whom he identifies himself,[12] or does not.[13] (3) Jesus meant himself as the suffering one whose witness by word and deed and death will prepare the soil for the kingdom's coming.[14] (4) Jesus first used the phrase to mean simply "I" or perhaps "I as God's Messiah"; then as he became more and more conscious of the suffering servant nature of his fate, the title gathered these associations about it and meant "I whom God has anointed to suffer"; finally, as death seemed more probable and the victory to lie on the other side of the grave, he used it to mean,

6 H. D. A. Major, *The Mission and Message of Jesus,* p. 110; John Bowman, *The Intention of Jesus* (Philadelphia, 1943), p. 124; Montefiore, *op. cit.,* p. 65.

7 C. T. Craig, in *The Interpreter's Bible,* Vol. VII, pp. 149, 150; Montefiore, *op. cit.,* p. 68.

8 Montefiore, *op. cit.,* p. 65.

9 Bowman, *op. cit.,* p. 143.

10 Manson, *op. cit.,* p. 164.

11 Branscomb, *op. cit.,* pp. 145, 146; Montefiore, *op. cit.,* p. 72.

12 Maurice Goguel, *The Life of Jesus* (New York, 1933), pp. 572, 573.

13 Grant, *op. cit.,* p. 774.

14 Montefiore, *op. cit.,* p. 18.

"I who will suffer and die, but whom God will raise and appoint to come in glory as Judge."[15] In support of this kind of interpretation William Manson writes:

> The ultimate basis of the self-recognition of Jesus as the Son of man is to be found not in any special developments of Jewish apocalyptic tradition, whether in Enoch or elsewhere, nor in any Son of man myth current in that age, but in the depth of a religious spirit which, grasping that the true nature of all glory and service, especially of all redemptive service, is revealed in suffering and sacrifice, applied this conception to the coming Son of man. . . . On this view it is the "man of sorrows," the man who identifies himself with his own sinful nation to the extent of making its guilt and tragedy his own (Is. 53), who is raised to glory as the Redeemer-Man (Dan. 7:13-14). The Son of man is thus united in his solidarity with men as their friend, helper, benefactor, vicarious substitute, and intercessor. So he becomes their Saviour.[16]

(5) Jesus merely means "I" without any fixed dogmatic connotation.

The trouble with all these interpretations, save the first and the last, is that they must lean so heavily upon later faith and hope. They also fail to take seriously enough certain other factors that are deeply set in the tradition, in particular: (1) The fact that the record admits that the disciples did not expect either the crucifixion or the resurrection. (2) The gospel idea that Jesus desired to keep his messiahship a secret.[17] (3) The psychological improbability that any Jews of Jesus' time would have been able to see in a human teacher the coming glorious Man from Heaven, or even understand and accept a self-designation in those terms. (4) The fact that the title "Son of man" cannot be sharply defined and mixes many elements from other figures.[18]

## V

Suppose, now, we turn to the Markan pericope, determined to forget any dogmatic meanings for the terms "Son of man" or "Messiah." Let us read these terms as blandly as possible, assuming that Jesus had no interest in any title, or that an old phrase on his lips acquired new meaning. What is the main emphasis of the pericope, studied in this fashion? "And Jesus . . . asked his disciples, 'Who do men say that I am?' And they told him, 'John the Baptist'; and others, 'Elijah'; and others, 'One of the prophets'" (Mark 8:27-28).

If Jesus is not interested in titles, why does he ask such questions? In the light of the teaching and the walking of the way of the Cross that follows, is it not reasonable to think that Jesus wanted thus to gain loyal commitment to him, that his disciples might be able to see and follow God's way and be fellow-laborers and witnesses of the kingdom of the same spirit as himself, i.e., utterly self-forgetting?

> And he asked them, "But who do you say that I am?" Peter answered him, "You are the Christ." And he charged them to tell no one about it [or him]. (Cf. Luke 9:21.) And he

15 *Ibid.*, 74, 75; Grant, pp. 641, 642; Bowman, pp. 144, 145; Manson, pp. 145, 161.
16 Manson, *op. cit.*, pp. 164, 165.
17 Montefiore, *op. cit.*, pp. 180, 181.
18 Manson, *op. cit.*, pp. 141, 142.

began to teach them that the Son of man must suffer many things and be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes and be killed, and after three days rise again. And he said this plainly, and Peter took him and began to rebuke him (Mark 8:29-32).

Obviously, Peter could hardly have thought that Jesus meant by "Son of man" the coming glorious judge. Just as obviously Mark, who records this conversation, identifies "Son of man," with Messiah. It seems evident, too, that Peter interpreted Jesus' "Son of man" to refer to himself. What was the offense against which Peter revolted? Was it the dogmatic idea that the Messiah should suffer? Perhaps. The Davidic king was surely not expected to suffer rejection. Suffering would more likely have been viewed as a sign that the man was not the true Messiah, that he was rejected of God. But is it not more likely that the basic reaction of Peter here is to the thought that Jesus would suffer and die—Jesus his master and friend? In the light of the unexpectedness of Jesus' resurrection, is it also not reasonable to suppose that Jesus' reference here to resurrection was interpreted by Peter and the disciples, not in terms of a special resurrection, but of a general resurrection at the last day, at the time of judgment—the day of the coming of the Son of man? It is even possible that this was Jesus' own original expectation. If so, this passage might be paraphrased as follows:

Who do people say I am? . . . . What do you think? That I am the anointed of God? . . . . You had better not use that word. . . . I am anointed—but that I am not the anointed King will be evident. . . . I am anointed to witness to God and his kingdom unto suffering and death. . . . Soon after that witness is completed shall come the resurrection, the hour of victory for God's kingdom, the coming of the kingdom in full power, the day of judgment. . . .[19]

In this light it would be understandable why Peter reacted so violently and also why his protest called forth from Jesus an equally violent reaction: "Turning and seeing his disciples, he rebuked Peter, and said, 'Get behind me, Satan! For you are not on the side of God but of men' " (Mark 8:33).

It is noteworthy that these words parallel the Q account of Jesus' temptation (cf. Matt. 4:4, Luke 4:4 f.). Here is the temptation to seek to serve God as an earthly king, rather than through the witness of humble, suffering love. To this temptation Jesus responds by saying in effect: "Peter, are you, too, in the service of the tempter? Do you want me—like the rest—to demand from God an earthly crown and kingdom?"

Whether or not the passage that follows belongs with the previous conversation,[20] its words belong to the spiritual context:

If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me. For whoever would save his life will lose it; and whoever loses his life for my sake and the gospel's will save it. For what does it profit a man to gain the whole world and forfeit his life?

19 Grant, *op. cit.*, p. 767; Craig, pp. 149, 150.
20 Branscomb, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

For what can a man give in return for his life? For whoever is ashamed of me and my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him will the Son of man also be ashamed, when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels (Mark 8:34-38).

There are many detailed problems of language here and in the parallel passages (Matt. 16:24-27, Luke 9:23-27).[21] Similar teachings appear in Matt. 10:33, 38-39; Luke 14-27, 17:33, 12:9. The natural emphasis of the opening words is quite clear and might be paraphrased thus: "I tell you, any man who wants to go my way must face this same temptation that I am facing. He must be indifferent to what happens to him in this world. He must be ready to die for God and his kingdom." Montefiore properly raises the question: "Is it possible that Jesus anticipated that any disciple who accompanied him to Jerusalem was in danger of dying there, even as he?"[22]

When we turn to the final sentence (v. 38) it certainly appears that Jesus is viewing the coming of the Son of man as judge quite objectively, without any necessary identification with himself. This parallels the Q teaching: "He who denies me before men will be denied before the angels of God" (Luke 12:9). The same idea appears in Jesus' words to his disciples: "He who hears you hears me, and he who rejects you rejects me, and he who rejects me, rejects him who sent me" (Luke 10:16). The point Jesus seems to want to make is this: "If you reject me and my way—if you are ashamed to follow this way of witness through suffering and death, you will be yourselves rejected of God when the day of judgment comes. The Judge will be ashamed of you."[23] We may well recall in this context Jesus' words to James and John when their earthly ambition made then proud and eager for special glory and honor. Striking this same note of humble self-forgetfulness in the service of God's kingdom, he said: "Whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be slave of all. For the Son of man also came not to be served but to serve and give his life as a ransom for many" (Mark 10:43-45). If, now, we may read the final verse in this thought-context, which says: "Truly I say to you that some are standing here who will not taste death before they see the kingdom of God come with power" (Mark 9:1), the concluding thought is the comforting and terrifying assurance that all this which Jesus is speaking about will occur in the lifetime of some of his disciples.

## VI

Read in this fashion the pericope fits the continuing story of Jesus' witness in Jerusalem, the Gethsemane agony, and the final prayers from the cross, all of which suggest that Jesus did not anticipate dogmatically either the human failure of his mission or a special interference and rescue as a personal reward. At every

21 Grant, *op. cit.*, p. 767.
22 Montefiore, *op. cit.*, p. 195.
23 *Ibid.*, p. 199.

point in the gospel record Jesus is pictured as humbling himself, forgetting himself completely, losing his life in his passion for God's kingdom.[24]

This idea of the radical character of Jesus' humility, which finds in lowly, creative service of God and man not a temporary means to a glorious end but the manifestation of the very heart of God, the deepest meaning of the creation and the incarnation, the revelation of the "humility" of the living God, deserves far more thought and study than has been given it. The idea is firmly fixed in the tradition, both of the gospels and of Paul's letters. It seems to me that it comes to expression in this reasonable conclusion of a thoroughly critical and evangelical study of this and parallel passages of the gospels, which suggests that Jesus was unconcerned about who he was because he was all-concerned to find and do God's appointed work.

## THE TRANSITION FROM SLOVAK TO ENGLISH

By J. Igor Bella

MANY things have been written about the relationship between language and religion, about congregations using a foreign tongue in a particular country, about the necessary change from a foreign tongue into the language of a country in order to preserve religious values, or the necessity to preserve the foreign tongue lest with its disappearance the religious values be lost too.

In a few lines I wish to present an example of a non-English congregation in the United States of America changing into an English one. The congregation is a Slovak congregation. I am choosing a Slovak congregation because I served one for many years as pastor.

*1920-1930.* This congregation is in an industrial city on the eastern seaboard. It was founded at the beginning of the century, when immigration from Central Europe was at its peak. In 1920, although already twenty years old, the congregation did not use English in its services. All services were in Slovak. Even to suggest the use of English was met with a certain hostility.

After World War I the Czechoslovak nationalism awakened. The Slovaks in Europe were liberated from Hungarian domination. America Slovaks worked for this liberation. Any suggestion of using English in the church was considered an attack on Slovak nationalism. It had been the policy of the Hungarian government to magyarize all the nationalities in Hungary. The Lutheran Church of Hungary fell readily into this political program and tried to force the Hungarian language upon non-Hungarian congregations and persecuted the so-called nationalist Slovak, Roumanian, or German pastors and other leaders of the church. The introduction of English was considered from this point of view. As one man said to me, "In Hungary they forced Hungarian upon the church, and now you are trying to force English upon it."

24 *Ibid.*, pp. 187, 188.

Religious education was also in Slovak. The pastor had to teach the Slovak language in the church school so that, on the basis of this knowledge, the children might study the Bible and the Catechism in Slovak. The children, of course, knew some Slovak because it was spoken in their homes. But since instruction in public schools was in English, the teaching of Slovak went with considerable difficulty. In order to teach the Slovak language more thoroughly vacation schools were held to which children came daily for six weeks during the summer.

Although in America, we had a completely Slovak congregation. It was isolated from American life, and what is more, from American church life, for it was without interest in the work of the church as a whole. It had a nationalistic orientation, and the emphasis in the name "Slovak Lutheran" was on *Slovak*. The people were more interested in what was happening in the Lutheran Church in Slovakia, and in their particular native village in Europe, than in what was happening in the Lutheran Church of America, or in America. When one spoke of American Lutheranism the answer invariably was: "Who cares about it? It does not concern us Slovaks."

In the middle of the decade the first wedge was introduced into this Slovak shell by means of intermarriage. Girls married young men who could not understand Slovak, and vice versa. The children of immigrants grew up and, naturally, in many cases married non-Slovak Lutherans or others against the wishes of the parents. In those days to marry a non-Slovak was considered a major tragedy in the family. Intermarriage, however, could not be stopped. At first such couples usually joined an English congregation and thus the Slovak congregation lost members. The young people left the church not for religious but for linguistic reasons. The wife or husband did not understand Slovak, but both of them understood English, and so they joined an English congregation.

When more such cases occurred the question was raised: Why not English services? But opposition was great. One woman told me: "We have no reason to have English services. This congregation stands and dies as a Slovak congregation." There were others, however, who favored introducing English, and a controversy ensued which lasted many years.

Another wedge was introduced into the hard shell of Slovak exclusiveness when the second generation was growing up. The oldest children of immigrants understood and spoke the language of their parents quite well. They learned English in the public school, but at home they spoke Slovak because the parents understood only Slovak. However, when there were more children in the family they were able to speak English with one another at home. English was thus introduced into the home. Because of this the younger children began to speak Slovak less and less. They understood it, but spoke it very little, and were unable to learn their Catechism in Slovak. In spite of this the parents tried to force their children to take religious instruction in Slovak.

This had three very bad effects: (1) In the minds of the children religion became associated with Slovak and was thus isolated from everyday life. (2) Forc-

ing Slovak on children associated religion with something unpleasant. Because of this many in later life left the church entirely. (3) The children did not understand enough of the religious instruction. Although Slovak texts were explained in English, this was not sufficient. There was no time for detailed instruction beyond Bible History and the Catechism, and so the children learned nothing about the work of the church in America, about missions, etc.

And so, toward the end of the decade, the congregation was still Slovak. All services, religious education, and young people's work were in Slovak. The only English used was in connection with functions like marriages and baptisms when the parties involved did not understand Slovak.

*1930-1940.* In 1930 the first English service was held. It was thirty years after the founding of the congregation. The anti-English group simply had to abandon its stand because the younger people began to join neighboring English congregations, in most cases non-Lutheran. To remain Slovak meant the decay and eventual death of the congregation. Even now the die-hards said, "We must continue Slovak even at the price of diminishing numbers." For most people, however, the necessity of preserving Lutheranism was more important.

Before English services could be begun preparation was necessary. It was not a simple matter to switch from Slovak to English because religious education had previously been conducted in Slovak. The younger people did not know the hymns and the liturgy in English, and they did not understand many religious expressions. When the first English service was finally held, very few were present. The older members said, "I told you so!" Many came only out of curiosity, and after the English service they attended the Slovak service. However, slowly the attendance at English services began to grow. One of the reasons for the low attendance in the beginning was that the English services were held only once a month; people did not remember on which Sunday, and so they often missed them.

Between 1930 and 1940 the grandchildren of the original settlers were beginning to grow up. These grandchildren spoke almost no Slovak. The third generation was completely American. The congregation had to organize an English Sunday school. Confirmation classes and young people's societies were conducted wholly in English. Within five years a new English congregation was evolving. The attendance in the English services was growing Sunday by Sunday although the Slovak service was still considered the principal service. However, most of the weddings and baptisms were administered in English. On certain special occasions double services took place; everything was repeated in Slovak and in English—for example, one Slovak hymn, one English hymn, half of the liturgy in Slovak and half in English, one sermon in Slovak and one in English. For those who understood only one language it was very tedious. But this procedure is being followed in some congregations even today.

By 1940 English and Slovak services were about equally attended. With the growth of the English services interest in American church life became more pro-

nounced. Fraternization with other Lutheran congregations, many of which had gone through similar developments, became more common.

*1940-1950.* During and after World War II there was a steady decline in attendance at Slovak services. The first settlers were dying out. Non-Slovaks joined the church. In case of intermarriage with non-Slovaks, the latter usually became members of the Slovak church, which was really a bilingual church now. All services, functions, and religious education were in English, except that Slovak was used for one service on Sunday, and usually for funerals since the old people wanted to be buried in Slovak. The principal service was now the English service, and attendance at this service was double that of the Slovak. The average age of the original immigrants was now about sixty. When this group dies out, Slovak will vanish completely.

## SATURDAY SCHOOL FOR SUNDAY SCHOOL

By William H. Keil

TEN years ago the School Association of the Church of the Holy Trinity in Pittsburgh, Pa., began to make a study of the problems relating to education in its own parish. What prompted this study was the numerous institutes, study sessions, and workshops in Christian education which had been conducted in the neighborhood by church boards and agencies and which suggested that Sunday schools were not fulfilling their purpose. Although the Sunday school in Trinity Church was not threatened by collapse, so much concern was being shown on every hand, and by all church bodies, that the members of the congregation's School Association began to think that perhaps there was more that they could do for their own school.

Extensive and careful investigations were undertaken. Suggestions and criticisms, accumulated over a period of fifteen years, were reviewed and evaluated. Methods and materials abounded. There was merit in many of them. Complaints to the effect that materials were too scanty, or too involved, did not seem to be supported by the study. To test this conclusion the Sunday school employed literature of different kinds for two years, and various methods and approaches were employed. It all added up to this: the Lutheran Church has provided adequate literature, it has suggested helpful methods to meet problems, and it has been untiring in its emphasis on the true end of Christian education.

By the time the study had proceeded this far, the Association was very conscious of the important place of education in the work of the congregation. Moreover, the study had awakened the interest of most of the church councilmen, and other members of the congregation began to share in the deliberations. The Association was encouraged to believe that it was ready to adopt such guiding principles as these: (1) We must be willing to measure our educational work in terms

of effectiveness, and not merely in terms of the numbers reached. (2) We must be willing to make changes, if these changes will mean at least as good an approach to Christian education as we now employ. (3) We must be willing to adjust ourselves to a changing world, making allowance for differences between our environment and that of a generation ago. (4) We must be determined to help the whole church by strengthening the local congregation. The church council formally instructed the School Association to continue its study and to present its findings.

Two factors constantly obtruded themselves into the discussion which now continued. One was the time element. The other was the question of environment. There was no need for long debate on the severe limitation which one hour on Sunday morning imposed on the teachers in their endeavor to make the Christian way effective in the whole life of their pupils. Moreover, it was manifest that more time was not available on Sunday morning. It took longer to come to the realization that environment and atmosphere also imposed limitations on teachers and pupils. But finally the conclusion was reached that a major difficulty with the Sunday morning hour was that it militated against the development of an academic atmosphere and environment in which a real *school* could be conducted.

While casting about for ways in which to overcome these limitations, it was only natural that some thought should be given to a weekday or parochial school. It was apparent, however, that the establishment of such a school was too expensive, especially in the light of other tasks which confronted the congregation. Nor did there seem to be any reason why the church should reintroduce instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic after such instruction had, since the time of the Reformation, been turned over to the state. Besides, it was believed that the segregation of Lutherans which would likely result from the establishment of a parochial school would be good neither for the Lutherans themselves nor for the community as a whole.

A released-time program for instruction in religion was available in the public schools of Pittsburgh. Although children of the parish participated in this program and the pastor took his turn as instructor, the congregation's School Association was not inclined to regard the released-time program as meeting the real need of the parish. Not all of the instruction under interdenominational auspices was of such a character as to commend it and, besides, the parish had its own immediate responsibility to its children which could not be evaded by reliance on a makeshift arrangement in connection with public school education.

Finally, in October, 1948, the School Association was ready to make recommendations to the church council and, through the church council, to the congregation. It recommended that the existing Sunday school be replaced by a Saturday school for children up to the age of 15; that this school be operated on Saturday mornings from 9 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. from September to June, parallel to the public school program; and that classes and instruction follow the best educational practices so that a real school, in the best sense of the term, might result. These recom-

mendations were adopted unanimously by the congregation, and a school was established with the following schedule:

| | |
|---|---|
| 9:00- 9:40. | First class period. |
| 9:40-10:00. | First assembly period for all classes, devoted to music, general projects, study of church membership, etc. |
| 10:00-10:20. | Recess. Emphasis on establishing friendships, games, handwork, children selecting their own activity. |
| 10:20-10:40. | Second assembly period. Pupils divided according to interest: group instruction in the Catechism, worship, etc. |
| 10:40-11:20. | Second class period. |
| 11:20-11:30. | Closing ten-minute period for teachers and classes. |
| 11:30-12:00. | Choir rehearsal and instruction. This period was added after the first year. |

A registrar takes care of attendance records and offerings when pupils enter the school building so as to free the teachers from this time-consuming burden. Handwork is used in classes only when it is definitely and constructively related to the instruction, and such alien importations as Santa Clauses, Easter bunnies, etc., are forbidden. Substitute teachers are available in case of absence on the part of a regular teacher. A "feature teacher" occasionally presents special features to classes in rotation.

The operation of this Saturday school during the past five years has confirmed that there are certain advantages in the program. (1) There is more time for instruction than there was in the Sunday school. As a consequence the learning experience has been greatly enriched, memory work has been increased, and understanding has been deepened. (2) Teachers are as pleased as pupils. They have been encouraged to prepare for their teaching, for they have more time in the classroom in which to use their preparation and they feel that they are confronted with a serious duty in an honest-to-goodness school. It is noteworthy that teacher absenteeism has been reduced 75 percent! (3) Catechetical instruction and choir work are consciously made a part of the parish program of education. They are not thought of as unrelated appendages. (4) Children of the parish become better acquainted with one another than was formerly the case. This increases the sense of community. (5) Conducting the school on Saturday has encouraged family worship (parents with their children) on Sunday, when two services are held. Children are not so restless in church. Moreover, teachers who formerly came to the morning service directly from Sunday school, and who were therefore often harried and exhausted, now attend church services in a better frame of mind and spirit.

Some statistics will throw further light on the benefits experienced in this one parish when the Sunday school was replaced by a Saturday school. The enrollment in the school of Trinity Church increased 44 percent in five years, ac-

companied by a 24 percent increase in the congregation's confirmed membership. Of the total enrollment, 54 percent of the children come from outside the parish—23 percent unchurched, 17 percent Roman Catholics, and 4 percent Eastern Orthodox. Without attendance campaigns, rewards, or notices of resumption of classes after vacations, the average attendance has been 85 percent of the enrollment as compared with 73 percent in the former Sunday school. There are no available long-range statistics on the attendance of children at Sunday church services, but during one quarter 34 percent of the church attendance was by persons under the age of 21. This is far in excess of the attendance by children before the introduction of the present program.

It should be stated that the congregation in which this Saturday school was established is neither a wealthy nor a large congregation. Other congregations have superior equipment and resources. Whether or not a similar plan will work elsewhere must be determined by those who are on the ground—by persons, it is to be hoped, who are willing to try something new for the sake of a more effective program of parish education. "It is not necessary that human traditions, . . . instituted by men, should be alike everywhere" (Augsburg Confession, Art. VII).

## NAVY CHAPLAINCY AND THE NATIONAL LUTHERAN COUNCIL

By Gordon Lindemann and
C. Charles Bachmann

THE Rev. Paul E. Seidel, appointed May 16, 1916, was the first Lutheran chaplain in the United States Navy. Recruitment of Navy chaplains in the Lutheran Church came as a result of the report of H. K. Carroll to the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America in 1914. He corresponded with four to five hundred clergymen of various Protestant denominations and encouraged the denominations to set up commissions for chaplains. The seed sown in 1914 came to fruition in 1917. In that year, on Oct. 19, 1917, the National Lutheran Commission for Soldiers' and Sailors' Welfare was formed. One of the main purposes of this Commission was to select Navy chaplains. Under the direction of the Chaplaincy Committee, eleven pastors were chosen for the Navy. This was the beginning of Lutheran cooperation among eight supporting bodies and led to the formation of the National Lutheran Council in 1918. This agency then assumed responsibility for the formation of policies which affected the role of Lutheran chaplains in the Navy, as well as exerting a large measure of influence among the major denominations in America.

*The Years of Crisis (1941-1945).* Responsibility for an adequate ministry to the men and women in the armed forces was keenly felt by the National Lutheran

Council when hostilities once again broke out. Dr. N. M. Ylvisaker was chosen to direct the Service Commission in 1941 in order to provide a ministry both in service centers and in the armed forces. It was largely through his efforts that the Service Commission functioned as an effective instrument. Dr. Ylvisaker was particularly suited to this position by virtue of his service in the army chaplaincy during World War I and as president of the Military Chaplains' Association. At the time of his appointment there were 64 Lutheran chaplains in the armed forces. Of this number 9 were serving with the Navy, according to the official record. At the time of Pearl Harbor 13 Navy chaplains were on duty, nine regular and four reserve. Between the years 1940 and 1945, 629 pastors gave up civilian parishes to serve in the armed forces; 244 were Navy chaplains.

The value of the Service Commission can hardly be measured in statistics because of the yeoman service that was rendered in terms of procurement and service to the Navy Department. The responsibility for screening and endorsing chaplains was a major task which contributed to the channeling of chaplains according to national Lutheran strength. This type of service did not make the headlines, but it contributed to the effectiveness of the church. It seemed up to this point that the Lutheran Church had never taken its full share of shouldering the responsibility for its service personnel. When the crisis came there was a sudden surge of concerted action by an agency that had won the respect and admiration of the cooperating bodies of the National Lutheran Council. It was ready for action at a moment's notice. It followed not only its servicemen but also its chaplains in the field, at home, and abroad, on land, at sea, and in the air. Lutheran chaplains were able to render not only an encompassing ministry to service personnel in general, but also a specific ministry to Lutherans away from home, by filling in the gap between the home church and the Navy. No statistics for the wide range of chaplains' services are available but, judging from the response to the Lutheran Servicemen's Centers in all parts of the country, it is not hard to conceive what an effective job was done. Wherever these chaplains served, they gave a good account of the stewardship of their time by a continuing effort just as if they had been in a civilian parish. They were "fishers of men" even though they were in uniform.

*The Road Back (1946-1948).* Just as swiftly as Navy chaplains had donned the Navy blue, they traded their uniforms for the garb of pastors when World War II closed. Most of the chaplains in the Navy maintained their interest, however, by remaining in the reserve on inactive duty. Some joined volunteer and active reserve units to keep up their contacts with the Navy. Others were so impressed with the large opportunity for missionary work that presented itself in the Navy that they remained on active duty or transferred to the regular Navy.

In a sense, however, the road back was paved with complacency, engendered by a false sense of security. The church went along with the times and was swallowed up in the business of reconstruction and rehabilitation. The National Lutheran Council was absorbed in other considerations, such as the tremendous undertaking of settling the displaced persons problem and of cultivating home mission fields

which were ripe for harvest. For home missions there began an unhealthy competition for available men who were graduating from the seminaries in order that gaps might be filled and holes in the home front might be plugged. The supply had been depleted when pastors donned the Navy blue or served in Service Centers. The Lutheran Church responded to opportunities for development in new areas where atomic plants and industries were mushrooming. The stage was set for reconstruction and defense, and yet there was a need for a continuing ministry in the armed forces. Behind the scenes there was still a concentrated and coordinated program for ministry to the military.

*A New Crisis (1948-1953).* In order to provide this continuing ministry the National Lutheran Council at its Richmond meeting in 1948 put into operation the Bureau of Service to Military Personnel. The plan for the new era went into effect. "The Bureau of Service to Military Personnel, commonly referred to as the Service Bureau, came into being on March 1, 1948, having been authorized by the N.L.C. at its Richmond meeting. Its purpose is to administer the *permanent phases* of the work formerly assigned to the Service Commission. It serves the constituent bodies by providing a coordinated ministry to their chaplains and their service personnel."[1]

The formation of this Service Bureau certainly embodied prophetic vision in terms of being ready when the new crisis came in 1950. The National Lutheran Council chose an able executive in the person of Chaplain Gynther Storaasli, Col. U. S. A., Ret., an ordained pastor of the Evangelical Lutheran Church who had served in the China mission field, as service pastor under the National Lutheran Commission for Soldiers' and Sailors' Welfare, and in the army chaplaincy during World War I. His interest continued after the war years and he served faithfully in various positions of importance in the Army for a period of twenty-eight years. His experience, ability, and service record made him easily adaptable to the large role he was called upon to play and is playing at the present developmental stage of the Bureau of Service to Military Personnel and its relationship to the chaplaincy program in the armed forces at the present time.

Until the time of the Korean conflict, Chaplain Storaasli's work consisted largely of reorganizing the old Service Commission and putting the machinery into working order with the prayerful hope that it would not have to be called into full operation. The hope was that this bureau would be able to conserve the reserve strength in the new chaplaincy and provide an effective channel for new blood to flow into the military chaplaincy either for readiness in the event of emergencies or for a challenging ministry in the armed forces. Universal Military Training was in the background of this move, and also the concern of the Lutheran Church for its people in the unprecedented "peace-time" defense organization. The international picture determined the course of action that was ultimately to be pursued by the Bureau of Service to Military Personnel. Regardless of the political thinking prevalent in any one church body or organization, the need for more chaplains was

1 *The National Lutheran,* Vol. 17, No. 3, Sept. 1948, p. 28.

felt immediately when the 38th Parallel was crossed in Korea and it became a matter of providing a ministry to those who were both voluntarily and involuntarily called to answer their country's call. Fortunately there was a reservoir of Navy chaplains who could answer a similar call and who could be selected because of their experience, age, and time in rank. The Bureau of Service to Military Personnel was called upon to make the distribution according to the relative strengths of the various Lutheran bodies in the National Lutheran Council.

It was the feeling of the Lutheran Church at large that this reserve could not always be tapped and individual cases had to be taken into consideration. This became a particularly trying task because many of the reserve chaplains had become involved in local parochial matters, family responsibilities, and other commitments, and were not always able or willing to uproot themselves or their families. It is to be noted, too, that the Navy Chaplains Corps was the last group to be ordered back to duty involuntarily.

Because of the Korean conflict the Bureau of Service to Military Personnel was alerted to secure endorsements for chaplains who were either volunteering or being called back to meet the mounting need. Inasmuch as this was technically a "police action," reluctance was felt even in the Chaplains Corps, but it became apparent in the communiques of the chiefs of chaplains that there would be a continuing commitment of chaplains for service.

It should be noted that the church was not "beating the drums" and blindly following the dictates of a military machine. It was primarily interested in maintaining a ministry to the personnel who were forced to respond to the call to colors. Whether men are called by choice or involuntarily, it is incumbent upon the church to lead its flocks in the military as well as in civilian callings.

*The Church and the Chaplain.* One of the distinguishing characteristics of the Lutheran Church has been its doctrine of the call to the ministry. While this was undoubtedly a factor which motivated pastors to respond to the call of the chaplaincy in the period of the crisis years, there is no less a challenge in times of peace. The significance of the call is not mitigated by the area of service or the field of labor; it is still God who calls. We submit that the call to the military chaplaincy is of the same order of importance as a call to a civilian parish.

Basic to American Lutheran church polity is the sovereignty of the congregation to issue a call, but the church has not always taken cognizance of this fact when it came to the military chaplaincy. There is no uniformity in National Lutheran Council churches with respect to the call to the military chaplaincy. The assumption is that it is taken care of, or will be taken care of, at the synodical level or national level. Some attempts have been made to rectify this situation within the National Lutheran Council churches by appointing committees to screen pastors and, in several instances, to call them. The initiative has been left to the individual pastor. This has happened because no effective overall agency, like the Bureau of Service to Military Personnel, has been responsible for articulating the call to the chaplaincy and providing effective machinery for procurement and processing for

endorsement. The Service Bureau has been allowed to do only the processing for endorsement. To effect a change in the present policy, it would be desirable to allow the executive director of the Service Bureau to acquaint the respective churches with the quota of chaplains needed on the basis of the total membership of each church: It would then be the responsibility of synodical presidents or national church presidents to issue calls, through the overall agency set up for this purpose, to pastors and seminarians. This would be consonant with our basic church polity.

There are certain factors which have militated against realization of this ideal. The competitive spirit of specialized interests has drained off the supply of pastors and, particularly, of seminarians. On the other hand, mere numbers is not the solution, because there is no basis established for a call to the chaplaincy in the armed forces other than desire by the individual pastor or seminarian to heed this call. The chaplaincy has been made important only in times of abnormal or crisis situations. The dramatic occasion which prompted our chaplains in World War II is lacking in the present situation. Recognition should be made of the fact that there is need for a continuing ministry to the men and women who are being subjected to military draft.

The basis for action inherent in the doctrine of the call is just as important to the military scene as it is to any mission field in which there is a cry "to come over and help us." The appeal of the men in the Navy in particular, and the armed forces in general, constitutes missionary enterprise demanding high priority in missionary zeal. The armed forces present a challenge never before felt in the history of the Lutheran Church of America. According to Major General Carpenter, Air Force's Chief of Chaplains, "the greatest mission field today for American churches lies in the armed forces."

A Chronological Listing of Denominations in the Chaplains' Corps U. S. Navy

| *Denomination* | *Date their Clergymen Entered* |
|---|---|
| Congregational | 1799 |
| Episcopalian | 1800 |
| Presbyterian | 1816 |
| Baptist | 1823 |
| Methodist | 1829 |
| Universalist | 1845 |
| Methodist (South) | 1847 |
| Disciples of Christ | 1885 |
| Roman Catholic | 1888 |
| Reformed | 1915 |
| Lutheran (ALC) | 1916 |
| Jewish | 1917 |
| Moravian | 1918 |
| United Brethren | 1918 |
| Christian Science | 1918 |

The following denominations entered their men during World War II:

Quakers
Nazarenes
Orthodox (Greek)
Independent Fundamentalists
Christian Missionary Alliance
African Methodist Church
Evangelical Church
Church of God
Church of The Brethren

An analysis made by Chaplain W. Wyeth Williard, April 29, 1942, showed that most of the Protestant chaplains came from the following six major denominational groups (the percentage being in relationship to the total figure of 2,934):

| *Denomination* | *Chaplains* | *Percent* |
|---|---|---|
| Presbyterian | 526 | 17.9 |
| Methodist | 470 | 16.0 |
| Baptist | 335 | 11.4 |
| Lutheran | 240 | 8.9 |
| Protestant-Episcopal | 202 | 6.2 |
| Congregational-Christian | 127 | 4.2 |
| | 1,900 | 64.6 |

Nineteen other bodies contributed the balance of 175 Protestant chaplains, or 6.1 percent of the entire corps.

## WAS ECCLESIA PLANTANDA MUHLENBERG'S MOTTO?

By Theodore G. Tappert

AMONG other uncritically accepted notions imbedded in the historical literature of the Lutheran Church in America[1] is the belief that *ecclesia plantanda* was the motto of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg. It has been repeated so often, by one historian after another,[2] that it may appear to be an act of impiety to cast doubt upon the legend. But it would be far more irresponsible to allow the misconception to stand.

1 Compare the persistent legend that German would have become the official language of the United States if it had not been for the intervention of Frederick Muhlenberg, and the legend that H. M. Muhlenberg supported the American Revolution.

2 For recent repetitions see L. P. Qualben, *The Lutheran Church in Colonial America* (New York, 1940), p. 208; Vergilius Ferm, *The American Church* (New York, 1953), p. 34; K. S. Latourette, *A History of Christianity* (New York, 1953), p. 957.

Muhlenberg betrayed a fondness for the biblical imagery which has to do with husbandry. This may be accounted for by his own rural background and by the agricultural environment in which he spent most of his life. But it also resulted from his preoccupation with and conception of the tasks which confronted him in his work. At all events, he frequently quoted and made allusions to such passages as I Corinthians 3:7, "So that neither is he that planteth any thing, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase." He often described his own work in such terms. After several baptisms he wrote in his diary, "May the Lord grant his blessing upon our planting and watering."[3] Young people who were under instruction in preparation for confirmation were, he said, being "planted and watered according to the grace which God bestowed."[4] In his early conflicts with Moravians and others Muhlenberg observed, "As soon as one has planted the smallest seedling and turned one's back, the parasites [i.e., the sectarians] fasten on it and seek to kill the roots."[5] And with reference to the need for schools he wrote, "It makes me perfectly happy to see good tree-nurseries [i.e., schools] planted in this wild country, for the old trees [i.e., Christians] die out, and if we plant no young trees, we cannot expect fruit."[6]

It was an easy and natural transition from such applications to a use of the same biblical imagery with reference to the whole American field. Not only individuals, but the entire church, required planting and watering. It was in this connection that the expression *ecclesia plantanda* appeared.

The Latin form *plantanda* may have misled some who encountered it and who did not take the trouble to scrutinize the context in which it always occurs. Similarity with the classical exhortation *Carthago delenda* [*est*], rendered "Carthage must be destroyed!" in textbooks of elementary Latin, probably suggested that *ecclesia plantanda* should be rendered "The church must be planted!" Of course, this is a grammatical possibility if the phrase stands by itself and if the verb form, a gerundive, is accompanied by *est* to express duty or obligation. But it never occurs in this way in extant writings of Muhlenberg, and there is no evidence to suggest that he ever employed the expression so.

As Muhlenberg used the expression, the verb form was adjectival, and descriptive rather than hortatory. The context in which the expression invariably appears makes this abundantly clear. A few examples will suffice to illustrate this. On Jan. 14, 1762, Muhlenberg wrote to John Philip Fresenius to request that more clergymen be sent from Europe *"für die hiesige Ecclesiam plantandam,"* for the church which is being planted here. "Your Reverences," Muhlenberg adds, "doubtless have a clear and precise idea of our *ecclesia plantanda* here," and concludes, "You will

3 *Journals of H. M. Muhlenberg,* ed. Tappert and Doberstein, Vol. I (Philadelphia, 1942), p. 215.

4 *Op. cit.,* p. 205.

5 *Op. cit.,* p. 213.

6 *Op. cit.,* p. 214.

render our *ecclesia plantanda* a very great service" by sending additional recruits.[7] When the Ministerium of North America met in 1766, the shortage of clergymen was deplored, and the minutes of the meeting recorded the complaint, "Where is a Reverend Ministerium to get laborers who are suited to circumstances in the *ecclesia plantanda* or *colligenda?*"[8] Here, as elsewhere, the parallel term *colligenda* is used: the scattered Lutheran colonists were to be gathered into the church. Gathering and planting were equivalents for Muhlenberg, and he used the harvesting term *colligenda* at least as often as he used *plantanda.* It is obvious that in all these instances we have an adjectival, and a descriptive rather than a hortatory, use of the gerundive.

Apart from the question of Latinity, it is of importance to observe that when Muhlenberg referred to the *ecclesia plantanda* in America he was always comparing it with the *ecclesia plantata* in Europe. There the church had already been planted: it was established on firm foundations; here it was not. Some of his colleagues who had come from Europe, he once wrote, were so wanting in adaptability that they confused the American *ecclesia plantanda* with "the *ecclesia plantata* or *fixa* in which they were brought up."[9] In the report of Muhlenberg and two other arbitrators who attempted to settle the strife occasioned in New Jersey by the Rev. J. A. Wolf, it is stated that "in Europe . . . there are hundreds of times as many opportunities as there are in this open, free country and in our *ecclesia plantanda,*" i.e., where the church is yet to be planted, to place the erring pastor in a more suitable situation.[10] To his fellow pastor, J. L. Voigt, Muhlenberg addressed this censure on July 10, 1766: "It seems that you have erroneous preconceptions, as if you had been called and sent here from the *ecclesia plantanda* into the *ecclesia plantata.* . . . I reported to the Reverend Fathers [in Europe] concerning the want of and need for laborers and appealed for laborers who were suitable for the *ecclesia colligenda.*"[11]

The contrast between Europe and America was also in Muhlenberg's mind when he referred to "the *ecclesia plantata* [the church which has already been planted in Europe], where there are certain departments, offices, and *salaria,* and where there are enough laborers to choose from. But here in our *ecclesia colligenda* we do not as yet have a choice, financial support is small and uncertain, and labors are abundant. In many places here one man must, on a meager salary, combine in his own person the duties of several offices; he must often serve simultaneously as preacher, schoolmaster, cantor, sexton, bell-ringer, catechist, rector, and his own *substitute* or *diaconus.*"[12] "Preachers here," Muhlenberg wrote abroad, "have no

7 In manuscript volume PM28, EJ17, located (as are other manuscripts cited) in the Archives in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.

8 *Journals of H. M. Muhlenberg,* Vol. II (1945), p. 313.

9 *Op. cit.,* p. 87.

10 *Hallische Nachrichten,* ed. Mann, Schmucker, and Germann, Vol. I (Allentown, Pa., 1886), p. 125.

11 Manuscript volume PM95, A 1765-67, p. 82.

12 Photostats in the Library of Congress, Washington, D. C., H. III, Korrespondenz 1769-70, pp. 61 f.

*salaria fixa* as is the case in the *ecclesia plantata."*[13] Sometimes he referred to the American church as the *"infans ecclesia colligenda,"*[14] the infant church which is being gathered, or as the *"ecclesia adhuc colligenda,"*[15] the church which is still being gathered.

Muhlenberg used the expressions *ecclesia plantanda* and *ecclesia colligenda* at least a hundred times in writings of his which have come down to us. He used the expressions in his later years as much as in his early years in America. Accordingly it is not as if he thought of the church as *plantanda* on his arrival in 1742 and as *plantata* at his death in 1787.[16] And certainly there is no evidence that Muhlenberg was conscious of fashioning a slogan or maxim—however excellent in itself—which might serve him or his contemporaries as a guiding principle.

13 Manuscript letter, Muhlenberg to Eike and Westphal, Sept. 6, 1785.

14 Manuscript letter, Muhlenberg to his son Henry, Oct. 25, 1779.

15 *Journals of H. M. Muhlenberg,* Vol. III (soon to be published), under date of Nov. 1, 1779.

16 The assumption of M. H. Richards, "Ecclesia plantanda plantata," in *The Lutheran Church Review,* VIII (1889), pp. 13-30.

# Book Reviews and Notices[1]

*My Servants the Prophets.* By Edward J. Young. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1952. 231 pages. $3.

This is a book about prophecy as an institution, not about the prophets as individuals. The author's purpose is, in his own words, "to pay due heed to the testimony which the Old Testament itself has to offer" on this subject (p. 13). The subject is a highly controversial one and Dr. Young enters the field as a controversialist. He is convinced that recent scholarly studies of prophecy in the Old Testament have failed in greater or less degree to take into account the view of prophecy which the prophets themselves maintained.

Dr. Young's theological standpoint is unequivocal. He stands in the spiritual succession of J. Gresham Machen and Benjamin Warfield, in the tradition of classic Protestant orthodoxy, strenuously loyal to the Scriptures. The book offers, therefore, a refreshing and stimulating change from the one-sidedly technical and critical Old Testament studies which have abounded on every side since men have been laboring in the shadow of Wellhausen.

Dr. Young has his own principle of criticism. It is the old but now little used *confessional* principle by which one's contemporaries, whoever they may be, are subjected to the judgment of Scripture itself on the very questions which they have raised. This confessional method assumes that the Scriptures of both the Old and the New Testament are a living witness, authoritative and autonomous. It therefore involves the strictest and most careful attention to the text. It believes that the Bible, if its teachings are properly investigated, can be its own defender. Dr. Young believes in the objective character of divine revelation as it shines through every page, every paragraph, indeed every expression and statement of the Scriptures. This is the classic Reformation position. It is to be distinguished on the one hand from neo-orthodoxy according to Barth, Brunner, and Reinhold Niebuhr. It is different on the other hand from the vulgar fundamentalism which fears scholarship and despises theology in its historic, churchly development.

Has Dr. Young succeeded in his singular undertaking? The answer will depend very much upon the reader's own attitude toward the questions involved. There are several reassuring facts to be observed about the author. He is willing to learn from those with whom he disagrees, and gratefully acknowledges their contributions. Furthermore, he does not claim to have all the answers himself or to be an infallible interpreter of the Old and the New Testament, to whose authority he bows. He knows that the Scriptures as they stand sometimes refuse to answer our questions; that in the sky where prophets and apostles shine like the stars forever and ever there are also dark areas, obscure spaces, cosmic dust clouds, which perennially hide portions of God's truth from man's ken. This acknowledgment is wholesome. It makes the book a rewarding study of prophecy.

In his first chapter Dr. Young takes his departure from the teaching of the book of Deuteronomy on the institution of prophecy. He gives a careful exposition of the *locus classicus,* Deut. 18:9-22. It happens that the reviewer, in preparation for a seminary lecture, had just gone through this passage not long before this book came into his hands. He feels that Dr. Young has added something to his own recent re-examination of this section and he finds himself in nearly complete accord with the exposition on pages 20-35. Dr. Young comes to

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

three significant conclusions as a result of his exposition of Deuteronomy on prophecy, including the special section in chapter 18: (a) Deuteronomy looks forward to a succession of prophets as spiritual guides to Israel. (b) The terms of the promise in chapter 18 are not completely fulfilled anywhere else in the Old Testament, but they are fulfilled in Jesus Christ, the "prophet like unto Moses." (c) Moses as prophet is placed by the Pentateuch (Deuteronomy, Exodus, Numbers) on a distinctly higher level than the institution of prophecy which follows after him. Moses is represented by the Old Testament as "more than a prophet." In even higher degree Jesus Christ is more than a prophet while summing up in his own person the whole prophetic succession.

Needless to say, Dr. Young repudiates the now widely popularized scholarly hypothesis that Old Testament prophecy as a religious institution had a Canaanite origin. On the question posed by scientific introduction he returns to the view of the substantial Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy, another unpopular position. His discussion of differing current views on the authorship of Deuteronomy is moderate and discriminating.

Other aspects of Old Testament prophecy treated in this book include the terminology of prophetism, prophecy and the theocracy, the relationship of the prophets to the cult, and prophets false and true. The final chapter discusses the theological basis on which the entire argument has proceeded, namely, the prophets as recipients of revelation. Here is a strong statement which serves to expose the weak theology lurking in some of the more pretentious studies of prophecy in recent decades. These latter have generally avoided theological issues and have concentrated heavily upon the *psychology* of the prophets (so Hölscher, Gunkel, Widengren).

There is a valuable appendix entitled "Extra—Biblical 'Prophecy' in the Ancient World." Here the recent archaeological discoveries in Mari and Egypt are laid under contribution. Dr. Young has made extensive use here and in the body of the book of Alfred Haldar's *Associations of Cult Prophets Among the Ancient Semites,* Uppsala, 1945. The latter is an indispensable aid to the comparative study of prophecy, Israelite and non-Israelite.

Dr. Young's conclusions as to the character of the "false prophets" are drawn entirely, but fully, from Old Testament data. He finds in the canonical prophetic writings references to three possible varieties of false prophets: (a) prophets who were deceived by a spirit of falsehood stronger than their own minds; (b) prophets in Israel who spoke in the name of other gods; (c) prophets who spoke in the name of Jehovah, but who drew only upon their own resources (their own "heart"). By contrast with all of these the true prophets spoke from Jehovah and not self-prompted out of their own minds. They were conscious that their message was not theirs but his who sent them.

Within the well-defined limits set by the author for this book it is an adequate and a competent study. It is marked by skillful exegesis and by cautious and sound reasoning. The criticism of opposing views is acute. The author has demonstrated the importance of a theological standpoint and method for the investigation of the Old Testament.

WILLIAM H. COOPER

*The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel.* By C. H. Dodd. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1953. xi, 478 pages. $8.

In some respects the universe of discourse in which the Gospel of John moves is like our own, but in other respects it is so different that the task of interpreting it without reading into it our own philosophical and theological presuppositions is extremely difficult. That is what gives Professor Dodd's thoroughgoing discussion of "general principles and lines of direction for the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel" a significance comparable to the work of E. F. Scott nearly half a century ago.

In Part I the author describes the setting of the Gospel of John in early Christianity, with ample citations from the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek sources that throw light on its "universe of discourse." He studies the higher religion of Judaism as revealed in

the Hermetic literature; Hellenistic Judaism as represented by Philo of Alexandria; and Rabbinic Judaism, Gnosticism, and Mandaism. He concludes that the Mandaic literature is too late to be used with confidence in reconstructing the environment of the Fourth Gospel.

In the light of this historical context, and with constant reference to the Old Testament, both in Hebrew and in Greek, Part II describes the leading ideas of the Gospel of John. These are symbolism; eternal life; knowledge of God; truth; faith; union with God; light, glory, judgment; Spirit, Messiah; Son of Man; Son of God; Logos. This part of the investigation is conducted with a minimum of assumptions concerning the nature of John's Gospel as a whole, and is noteworthy for the precision of its definitions.

These studies of the Evangelist's leading ideas in the light of their context in the religious experience and thinking of Christians, compared with non-Christians during the New Testament period, prepare for the examination of the argument and structure of the Gospel in Part III. Dodd does not start with the problems of hypothetical sources, redaction, and conjectural rearrangements of materials assumed to have been displaced in our manuscripts during the course of transmission of the Gospel. "I have examined several of these arrangements," he says, "and cannot sufficiently admire the patience and endless ingenuity which have gone to their making." But it is the duty of the interpreter "at least to see what can be done with the document as it has come down to us before attempting to improve upon it" (p. 290).

In describing the structure of the Gospel, Dodd divides it into "The Book of Signs" (chaps. 2-12), and "The Book of the Passion" (chaps. 13-20). He treats the first chapter as a "Proem," and chap. 21 as a postscript which "falls outside the design of the book as a whole." In the Book of Signs he distinguishes seven "episodes," each containing in itself "the *whole* theme of the gospel: Christ manifested, crucified, risen, exalted, communicating eternal life to men." These episodes are "connected by a subtle system of cross-references and correspondences, in which recurrent symbols and catchwords play a part" (p. 386).

The themes in the Book of Signs reappear in the Book of the Passion. "Sometimes the language of the Book of Signs is echoed, but with significant modifications; sometimes it is actually repeated, but in a setting which gives it a fresh turn" (p. 396). In composing the discourses in chaps. 13-17, the Evangelist appears to have had a twofold intention: "first, to interpret the death and resurrection of Jesus as the eschatological event in the fullest sense, and in doing so to reinterpret the eschatological beliefs of the early Church; and, secondly, to set forth the nature of the new life into which the disciples (and all Christians) are brought through Christ's death and resurrection" (p. 399). Likewise these Johannine ideas come to the surface in the story of the Passion itself. Concerning the farewell discourse, it is "true that the dramatic setting is that of 'the night in which He was betrayed,' with the crucifixion in prospect. Yet in a real sense it is the risen and glorified Christ who speaks" (p. 397). We may add that this observation holds true not only of chaps. 13-17, but of every other chapter in this Gospel. These conclusions show that the Fourth Gospel as it stands is the product of a single creative mind, and that the elaborate hypotheses which assume redactions and displacements are not required to explain its present argument and structure.

These considerations lead also to the conclusion that the Fourth Gospel is "in its essential character a theological work, rather than a history" (p. 444). But Dodd does not hold with those critics who call it myth: "In seeking to interpret the facts he records, the Fourth Evangelist is not necessarily extending the limits proper to history," and "it is important for the evangelist that what he narrates happened." However, like many ancient writers, "he has put into the mouth of his characters speeches which, since they bear not only the stamp of his own style, but also the stamp of an environment different from that in which the recorded events took place, cannot be regarded as historical" (pp. 444-445).

Consequently, the structure of this Gospel was not dictated by the chronological sequence of past events, but by a creative movement of thought which is "more like that of a musical fugue" (p. 383). There is therefore no need to "be wasting time in trying to harmonize the order of Mark with the order of John directly by such puerile expedients, for example, as the assumption that the temple was cleansed twice over, or in attempting to fit the movements between Galilee and Jerusalem into a precise chronological scheme" (p. 448). Dodd thinks that John is in large measure "working independently of other written gospels" (p. 449); that the Johannine maxim, 'The hour is coming, and now is,' derives from a source which placed less emphasis on the eschatological expectations than did the Synoptics; and that this formula "probably represents the authentic teaching of Jesus as veraciously as any formula could" (p. 447).

The special value of Professor Dodd's work lies in its re-emphasis on the environment of the Fourth Gospel, its careful definitions of the leading Johannine ideas, and its demonstration of the unity of this Gospel. Used as a compass through a forest of questions, it will alert the interpreter to certain either-or fallacies which are involved in setting Jerusalem against Athens, divine revelation against human philosophy, eschatology against evolution, the Fourth Gospel against the Synoptics, and the best of the New Testament against the worst of the Old. A no-thoroughfare sign is posted against the temptation to return to the trail of Marcion by assuming discontinuity between revelation and history, cutting the Gospel from its context in the Graeco-Oriental world, and then canonizing one's own theophilosophical speculations as the only true revelation of God.

There is, however, one point on this compass where the fixing of the direction runs into difficulty. It concerns our view of the relation between the kingdom of God and history. In describing John's shift of emphasis from the Synoptic form of the Christian hope to the concept of eternal life beginning now, Dodd continues to speak in terms of "realized eschatology," although he admits that this phrase is "not altogether felicitous" (p. 447). In view of what has happened to his exegetical arguments for this interpretation, that is certainly an understatement of what is the matter with it.

"Realized eschatology" implies that the kingdom of God has come with Jesus, in whose ministry, death, and resurrection its essential meaning as salvation, judgment, and defeat of Satan has already been fulfilled. The consummation is abstracted from earth and located in the eternal world, leaving history to go its tragic way indefinitely. On its theoretical side, this world-view runs into difficulties at least as formidable as those which confront belief in the possibility of progress toward the consummation of the kingdom on earth. On its practical side, it narrows the scope of the Christian mission, restricts the incentives of Christian action, and risks complacency and make-believe. Is such a philosophy of history required by the Fourth Gospel?

In the development of the Johannine fugue we hear a series of variations on the missionary theme of Acts 1:6-8. God the Father and Jesus Christ whom he has sent are always working, and on Easter evening this same Jesus commissions his friends: "As the Father has sent me, even so I send you" (20:21). The scope of this invitation to participate in God's ongoing work of creation beggars the imagination (14:12-14; 16:12-15). Here there are no clouds or eschatological fire-chariots, but a Vine with many branches quietly bearing "much fruit" to the increasing glory of God on earth.

We do not know how the Fourth Evangelist thought the destiny of human society would be affected by this fruit-bearing; a long evolution was not within his purview. Yet his Gospel is full of growing things which invite confidence that the fruit of the Vine is meant for the transformation of society as well as for the salvation of the individual. The farther we follow the other lines of investigation indicated on our author's compass, the more clearly we see that the work of the interpreter has only begun when he has turned John's *nun estin*

into "now is." Sooner or later the same powerful creative impulse which gave us this Gospel is going to break the eschatological fetters which our age of discouragement has imposed upon it.

RAYMOND T. STAMM

*The Qumran (Dead Sea) Scrolls and Palaeography.* By Solomon A. Birnbaum. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1952. 52 pages. $1.50.

This monograph is designated as Nos. 13-14 of the Supplementary Studies to the Bulletin of American Schools of Oriental Research. It is part of a prolonged discussion of the date of the scrolls, and has many references to earlier articles on this topic. The author answers critics who have objected to the dating of the Isaiah Scroll about 150 B.C. (proposed by himself, Albright, and others), and gives further evidence and argument for such dating. The critics include scholars such as Kahle who are eminent in O. T. studies but are not competent to discuss this topic because they are not specialists in palaeography.

The science of palaeography is concerned largely with details in the shapes of letters—observing the sequence of the variations in these shapes as found in manuscripts of known date or period, and thus finding the direction in which the development moved. A simple example is given in the way of making a final Mem. At an early stage the left-hand stroke did not meet the bottom cross stroke (so sometimes in the Isaiah Scroll); later it did meet it, making a closed figure; and still later it did not meet the top cross stroke. Angles at which component lines in letters are drawn, length of lines, curved or straight lines, are other factors which need to be considered. When the letters in a new manuscript are carefully studied, and their forms are located at the appropriate place in the sequence that has been established, the date of the manuscript is indicated.

The author gives several charts for such comparative study of forms of letters, and indicates and interprets the significant points. An attentive reader, even without previous knowledge of the subject, can get a fair idea of the principles and methods involved. The author exposes mistakes in fact and fallacies in argument of which his opponents have been guilty. He gives some incidental items of interesting information, e.g., that parchment was in use as early as 195 B.C. (some have said it was not before the Christian era), and that in the era under discussion all biblical manuscripts were written entirely in the "square" characters, but in non-biblical manuscripts the sacred Name (YHWH) was written in archaic characters.

The attacks on the second century dating are refuted, and the date seems well established. The Habakkuk Commentary is a little later (100-50 B.C.), and the Leviticus fragments are much older.

HAROLD L. CREAGER

*Bibelens Dyreliv.* By Vilh. Møller-Christensen, M.D., and K. E. Jordt Jørgensen, Dr.Theol. Copenhagen: De Unges Forlag, 1952. Paper, 200 pages.

This is an up-to-date description of the fauna of the Bible. Often the great beauty and force of biblical literature is due to the careful observation of nature and intimate knowledge of animal life displayed by the authors. To get the full force of passages that are illustrated by animal life the modern reader needs to know what these creatures were and how they lived and how the men of Bible times felt about them. The present volume supplies this information, by drawing on exact biological science, wide knowledge of archaeology and biblical literature, and a fine sense for the meaning of Scripture. Every animal of the Bible is treated.

The book is divided into three parts: mammals, birds, and a third section on insects, reptiles, and fishes. Each article gives the Hebrew or Greek name (transliterated), the scientific name, a careful identification, and a fascinating description of important characteristics of the subject. Then follows the quotation of important Bible passages, which often spring into new life and take on

their real meaning, because of the exact information on animal life that has preceded. There are twenty-one illustrations, all of which are taken from archaeology, especially from Assyrian and Egyptian sources, and which depict the animals as ancient men saw them.

Fascinating in style and adequate in indexing and arrangement, the book should prove of value for the general reader as well as for the pastor and teacher. (Incidentally, one wonders why the R.S.V. in Prov. 30:26 gives "badger" for *schaphan,* instead of "cony," where badger does not fit at all.)

It is to be hoped that an English edition may be forthcoming. The authors plan to publish a similar work on the flora of the Bible in the near future.

ETHAN MENGERS

*A Fresh Approach to the New Testament.* By H. G. G. Herklots. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Cokesbury Press, 1950. 176 pages. $2.

Pastors, teachers of Bible, and all who desire an increase in intelligent Bible study should welcome this volume. Its purpose is to provide a key to the understanding of the New Testament as the literature of a widespread and successful missionary movement. It is a popular and readable presentation, has a sympathetic grasp of the religious significance of the New Testament, and shows mastery of sound literary and historical study.

Canon Herklots begins with a study of the background and motivation of the missionaries. He seeks to show why they undertook their difficult and hazardous task and to understand the religious experience that moved them to act as they did. He next analyzes the message they tried to communicate, the field in which they proclaimed it, and the rival faiths with which they had to contend. He presents an effective sketch of a missionary party at work in Philippi, providing background for an illuminating introduction to Paul's letter to the Philippians. The concluding chapters trace the growth of the New Testament in response to the needs of the Christian community.

W. A. QUANBECK

*The Joy of Study.* Edited by Sherman E. Johnson. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951. 163 pages. $2.75.

One of America's most eminent New Testament scholars is honored in this volume of essays presented to F. C. Grant on his sixtieth birthday by his students, colleagues and friends. The volume contains thirteen essays, a short biographical sketch and appreciation of Professor Grant's work, and a list of his publications. The essays range from the short and perhaps only half serious note by John Knox suggesting that Mark 14:51-52 is to be understood as a proleptic account of the resurrection, to the articles by Arthur Jeffery on "The Descent of Jesus in Muhammedan Eschatology," and A. D. Nock, "Soter and Euergetes."

Short summaries of some of the essays may convey an idea of the book's contents. Holt H. Graham examines the Synoptic Gospels for evidences of the influence of Palestinian Judaism upon the early Christian understanding of the common life. "Overconversion in Paul's Churches," by H. J. Cadbury accumulates evidence to show that Paul's missionary methods produced converts more radical than himself, and compelled him to moderate their extremism. In "The Wisdom of the Corinthians," Robert M. Grant suggests that Apollos encouraged the Corinthian Christians to interpret their religion as a form of popular philosophy, and that they were influenced by both Stoic and Essene ideas.

Philip Carrington's essay "Saint Peter's Epistle" states the case for Petrine authorship, siding with Selwyn against Beare. He discusses the arguments from style and literary dependency and questions the assumption of fictitious authorship. Sydney Temple examines the references to "Geography and Climate in the Fourth Gospel" and concludes that the author had an intimate knowledge of conditions in Palestine. C. T. Craig discusses Paul's use of the

phrase "Body of Christ" and points out its implications for an understanding of the Church.

W. A. QUANBECK

*En bok om kyrkans ämbete.* Edited by Hjalmar Lindroth. Stockholm: Svenska kyrkans diakonistyrelses bokförlag, 1951. 309 pages.

The publisher's preface announces that this symposium on the doctrine of the ministry grew out of a seminar held, under the leadership of Professor Lindroth, at Upsala University in 1949, 1950, and 1951. The purpose was an objective study, rather than an attempt to make a case for any predetermined view. This aim is reflected in the table of contents, offering chapters on the concept of the ministry in the New Testament, the early church, the Greek Orthodox Church, the Roman Catholic Church, in the thought of Luther, in the Lutheran Confessions, in Orthodoxy and Pietism, and in the Lutheran Church in Germany. The final chapter, by Professor Lindroth, seeks to summarize the results of the investigations.

This work has been received with uneasiness in some quarters in Sweden. It does not present harmonious conclusions, and the diversity of views encountered here reflects tensions within the Church of Sweden as to the nature of the ministry. As we shall point out, some of the authors espouse views quite in accord with the historic Lutheran doctrine. But others speak in a strange voice, which is the more disturbing because it is expressive of a "high church" view which has won the support of a growing number—though still a minor fraction—especially among younger members of the clergy. The disturbing fact about this volume is not that one of its chapters is by a Roman Catholic. The character of the work as a survey makes that natural enough. The uneasiness is occasioned rather by the espousal of an allegedly "Romanizing" position by scholars within the Church of Sweden itself. It is predicted by some that Harold Riesenfeld will soon occupy one of the most influential New Testament professorships in the land. It is he who contributes the basic chapter on the New Testament concept of the ministry, and his exegesis, more scholastic than evangelical in character, seems less acceptable to Lutherans than to ministers with "Romanist" leanings. Though Professor Lindroth's theology is more moderately Lutheran, he reflects Riesenfeld's exegesis in his concluding chapter.

Both Riesenfeld and Lindroth make repeated use of the term "representative" to interpret the nature of the ministry, and it is what that term is made to bear which is disturbing. The treatment given it has a familiar sound to one who has read Roman Catholic exegesis.

Christ was both God's representative before men and man's representative before God. In the Old Testament God had three kinds of representatives: kings, priests, and prophets; but Christ himself was all three: king of a new people, high priest, and authoritative spokesman. His own threefold office he committed to the apostles, that is, to those appointed to the ministry, not to all whom Christ called into his fellowship. The Risen One continues his work, not simply invisibly, but visibly through those whom he has made his "representatives."

It cannot be that such authorization was to stop with the disappearance of the apostles. They in turn conferred their own functions on their successors. Thus Paul, by the laying on of hands, committed ministerial functions to chosen successors. They were clad with authority—to preach, to teach, to withstand error, to supervise congregations, and to appoint ministers for local churches.

Through the apostles and their successors the authority "to teach, to rule, and to sanctify" was committed to the hierarchy, whose roots are already evident in the New Testament. "One point often overlooked is that the administrative office represented by later bishops is no later creation."

A monarchical tendency was already present in the New Testament ministry. "The Gospels, Acts, and the Pauline Epistles all demonstrate that Peter held a dominant position in the circle of the apostles." He "embodied the unity of the church."

Like Christ himself, the ministry is clad

with the threefold office of king, high priest, and prophet. Its kingly authority demands obedience. Its priestly function is to mediate to men the redemptive work of Christ. And when Christ's representative speaks, Christ himself speaks, whether the utterance goes back to Jesus on earth or comes from the exalted Lord.

Furthermore the ministry is "representative" in another sense. It is also man's representative before God. The function of the ministry is seen most clearly in public worship. Here the meaning of "representation" is demonstrated. The minister stands in the place both of Jesus in the company of his followers and of Christ in the heavenly congregation. It is to the ministry, not to the church, that Christ says, "This do in remembrance of me." It is God's manner of operation that representation is mediated through a hierarchy of order: God—Christ—man—woman. Finally, it is through an unbroken "succession" in the office that Christ's work is mediated through the centuries.

So much for one point of view found in this symposium. We have already stated that certain other chapters present the familiar, historic Lutheran concept. This is notably true, for instance, in the chapter by Gösta Hök on "Luther's Doctrine of the Ministry" and in that by Ruben Josefson on "The Spiritual Office in the Confessions of the Swedish Church."

The call to the ministry is a call to the ministry of the *Word,* not to the priestly sacrifice of the mass. The office of preaching is the highest office. If there be a hierarchical order in the ministry, that is a purely human administrative expedient. God recognized only one office, the ministry of the Word, with like authority for all who fill that office. It is through God's call, rather than through ordination, that one is made a minister; ordination is not constitutive.

Luther rejects the Roman claims of a priestly "order" and of its jurisdictional powers. No such powers inhere in the clergy. "The power of the keys" has nothing to do with government of the church.

Scripture compels a break with the papacy and its theology, which is wrong both in its pretensions to power and in its sacrifice of the mass.

Luther's doctrine as to the ministry of the Word does not rise with him. It is the basic position of the New Testament itself.

The reviewer found this an engrossing book. It is hardly necessary to say that the issue here discussed is timely and urgent, not only among Lutherans, but in all present ecumenical developments.

CARL C. RASMUSSEN

*The Unfinished Reformation.* By Charles Clayton Morrison. New York: Harper, 1953. 236 pages. $3.

The title of this book relates it to the ecumenical movement, in whose interest the thesis of the volume was developed in the latest Hoover lectures at the University of Chicago. The Reformation, Dr. Morrison contends, was not a splintering of the church, as is often claimed, but an attempt "to release the ecumenical church from its captivity —to the hierarchical system" (24). Unfortunately the organs and functions of the church were taken over by the denominations. Their sin is that they have set themselves up as sovereign churches (66). "The ecumenical movement, therefore, like the Reformation, confronts a task of radical reform—a reform of Protestantism itself. It can accomplish its reform only by uncompromisingly calling for the complete dissolution of the churchism of the denominations in order that the ecumenical church of Christ's people may stand forth in strength and in empirical objectivity as the true church of Christ" (72-3). This "objectivity" of Christ's church is a major concern of the author. "The denominational system—has forced the true church into invisibility" (74). The completion of the Reformation would so reconstitute the church that the fulness of Christ's glory would appear, and most convincingly in the only kind of church the New Testament knows, the local church. "A local church is the ecumenical church manifested in a particular locality" (89).

The second half of the book contrasts the unity of the Protestant with that of the Roman Catholic, shows the fallacy of the faith

that the primitive church should be the ideal of the churches of our day, discusses three major obstacles—the idea of the historic episcopate, the practice of immersion-baptism, and congregationalism as a theory of church polity, and closes with a fervid description of the kind of Christian to be produced by the ecumenically united church.

We have learned to respect Charles Clayton Morrison's influence in contemporary American Christianity. This volume is but one more evidence of the breadth and intensity of his views on the unity of the church. There is passion in these pages for the church that Christ wants to be one, just as there is vehemence against the kind of false unity which necessitated the sixteenth century Reformation. We can share his passion, we can pray for a united Church of Christ. But that the goal can be reached by an elimination of the denominationalism in which for better or worse the objectivity of the Church is known to us today seems a bit utopian. We can no more go back to the sixteenth century than to the first. Where would the Church today be if the denominations had not conserved its functions? Would maybe the only church exercising those functions be the church of Rome, which never relinquished them? We may hope that the denominations may come to a unity of the church but for them to vote themselves out of existence will hardly guarantee *ipso facto* a finished reformation and a perfected church. This would "finish" only the denominations. The ecumenical movement must produce more positive results. This does not mean that we have any less hope than Dr. Morrison. It does mean that we interpret differently the objectivity of the Church of Christ and look for unity from within those denominations.

CONRAD BERGENDOFF

*Four Prophets of Our Destiny.* By William Hubben. New York: Macmillan, 1952. 170 pages. $2.75.

To understand some of the most forceful and influential theologians of today, men like Barth, Brunner, Tillich, and Niebuhr, it is necessary to become acquainted with the "existential" type of thinking which plays a major role in their philosophical orientation. To most of our pastors this whole realm of thought is a *terra incognita* which some fear and others desire to explore. Many who learned their theology in the intellectualistic thought-forms of seventeenth century Aristotelianism find it difficult to conceive that Christian truth can be expressed in any other way. Yet, as Pinomaa and Pelikan have pointed out, Luther himself was basically an existentialist, and the theology of the Reformation manifests its true vitality when approached from this point of view.

In the present volume an ex-Catholic Quaker with a German background provides a helpful introduction to existentialism by analyzing the lives and thoughts of four "prophets" of this school: Kierkegaard, Dostoevsky, Nietzsche, and Kafka. Kierkegaard's "leap of faith," Dostoevsky's romantic obsession with his fatherland, Nietzsche's nihilism, and Kafka's defeatism represent variant forms of facing ultimate issues with one's whole being. But common to all four are experiences of severe illness, mental as well as physical, disappointments in love and relations with fellow-men, and vehement discontent with conventional morality. All repudiated academic philosophy and operated with the human categories of fear, anxiety, and despair. All sensed the doom hovering over western culture and helped to speed the coming of the crisis. All were seers and rebels who "came too early in order to speak to us who must see to it that their message does not come too late."

The analyses are of uneven value. Kierkegaard and Dostoevsky are done masterfully, Nietzsche not so well, Kafka poorly. There is a running commentary on the implications of the four thinkers for present-day existentialism, religious and atheistic.

On the whole, this is a rewarding book. It probes the depths of the distress and the despair of the human soul, to which only the Gospel supplies the answer. The author observes correctly that all four of his existentialists "have a greater capacity for defining critical aspects of humanity's con-

dition than for giving voice to concrete leadership." He is also right in affirming that while Nietzsche and Dostoevsky, in spite of their heroic visions, were overcome by their weaknesses and anxieties, Kierkegaard's "firmly maintained Lutheran theology was his salvation." Kafka, on the other hand, reveals the utter spiritual exhaustion of the skeptic.

The author's clear and vivid style of writing makes the book highly interesting reading.

T. A. KANTONEN

*The Scriptures of Mankind. An Introduction.* By Charles S. Braden. New York: Macmillan, 1952. 496 pages. $6.50.

There are a number of anthologies which present selections from the sacred writings of the world's major religions for the use of students. There are also learned introductions to these writings, but they must be dug out of large series or out of scattered monographs which are more or less inaccessible to the student or average reader. In view of this Professor Braden undertook to prepare an introduction to sacred literature for the use, principally, of students. He defines this literature as generally conforming to a pattern: it is regarded, by those who accept it, as sacred, as divine in origin, as authoritative and therefore providing the foundation or source of a religion, and as limited to a canon.

Chapters of the book are devoted to a discussion, among others, of Egyptian, Babylonian, Indian, Chinese, Japanese, Persian, Hebrew, Christian, and Mohammedan sacred books. The last chapter also touches upon such more recent literature as that of the Mormons, Christian Scientists, etc.

It is intended that this volume should be read alongside of an anthology of sacred writings. But it is not necessary that this be done by the general reader. Each chapter of the book treats the origin, character, message, and influence of a particular group of writings and quotes from these writings by way of illustration. The style is very readable and the language is quite untechnical. The point of view of the author, who remains reasonably objective, may be described as that of a liberal Christian.

*Christian Faith and the Scientific Attitude.* By W. A. Whitehouse. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. 147 pages. $3.75.

For a number of years there has been a cry for something new and virile in the field of Christian apologetics. Emil Brunner, Paul Tillich and many others have sounded the warning against trying to hang on to an outmoded apologetic in a day which demands the very best. While no one man is able to meet the whole need in this field, W. A. Whitehouse has certainly made a real contribution in this book.

Mr. Whitehouse's approach is marked with the greatest honesty and clarity. He brings to us the rich experience of the Cambridge mathematician and the Oxford theologian in a very readable style. He is not afraid to state the position of the scientific attitude and the Christian faith in bold terms. In this work, he does not deal with problems which stand on the periphery but comes to grips with the chief issues. In so doing, he gives us some fundamental principles to follow. Being influenced by Barth, Mr. Whitehouse's position is that the materials treated in the Christian faith, or as he calls it "church thinking," are of such a nature that they belong to a field all of their own and therefore stand apart from the scientific, yet the Christian apologist must be just as careful in dealing with his material as the man of science is with his. They are both guided by the same set of underlying principles of candor, devotion to the task, etc.

Every minister who has allowed himself to drift into slovenly thinking in his Christian apologetics ought to read this book. Every scientist who has been tempted to look with disfavor upon the faith of the Christian church ought to study Mr. Whitehouse's position.

GEORGE F. SCHOTT, JR.

*Instruction in Christian Love.* By Martin Bucer. Translated by Paul T. Fuhrmann. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1952. 68 pages. $1.50.

Professor Fuhrmann, of Gammon Theological Seminary, here calls our attention to one of the literary gems of the Reformation by making it accessible to readers in English. Martin Bucer, as the translator's introduction observes, was a mediator among the Reformers who has much to say to us today. The little work here translated (its original title was *Das ym selbs niemat sonder anderen leben soll*) was Bucer's first publication and reflects the influence of Luther. It sets forth the duties of clergymen, rulers, and others in terms of Christian faith and love. Agriculture is the occupation which is most immediately useful to fellowmen. "Nowadays most men want their children to become clergymen. In the present circumstances, this means to lead a child into the most dangerous and godless position. The rest of men wish their children to become businessmen . . ." (pp. 39, 40). The burden of the treatise is not unlike that of Luther's *Treatise on Christian Liberty*: "Faith not only brings into us a complete trust in Christ, but it also restores us to that right and divine order in which we have been created. Moreover, through faith we are offered and accept his Spirit which makes us certain that we are children of God. As a result we gladly do all kinds of deeds of love for our neighbor . . ." (p. 46). The translation is provided with extensive linguistic and other notes.

*God At Work.* By James Parkes. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. 180 pages. $2.75.

Dr. Parkes in this book has tried to show why and how God's revelation of himself at Sinai and God's revelation of himself in science and its search for truth should be much more greatly stressed in themselves and in combination with God's revelation of himself at Calvary.

The truth shown to men at Sinai is described as the importance of community responsibility, under lay leadership without clerical hierarchy, continually to strive to understand and apply the written word of the Bible. The third revelation is described as the relatively recent development under God's guidance of science applied to extending the understanding and welfare of mankind; the author calls it Scientific Humanism.

The central importance of the revelation at Calvary is described as the revelation of the personal nature of God in the correct portrayal of Jesus as deity. However, no mention is made of the resurrection or the living Christ. An attempt is made to show that Christianity has been successful mostly in personal relationships and that its deepest failure has been "at the top and in the political field," in its inability to prevent selfish wars.

The doctrine of the Trinity as usually explained is assailed as out-of-date and of little use in the present world. Instead, says the author, this new trinity should be recognized, Judaism, Christianity, and Science, as above described, each part of equal importance and power.

One major difficulty in this thesis is recognized by the author himself, when he writes: "Unhappily, Jews, Christians, and Humanists alike will tend to resent and deny my ascription of equality to whichever of the events is not the foundation stone of their own faith."

A few of the author's points seem well put: his stress on more lay responsibility and control, on more and better use under God of science for man's welfare (against extreme neo-orthodoxy which damns all man's efforts as futile, even when acting in God's power and truth). An appendix "The Church Militant in the Political Field" describes a Christian university that should be established with various colleges to apply Christian truth in various fields; this is convincing and challenging.

But the author's few good points seem buried under a bizarre major thesis and arguments to support it. The thesis and its support may seem at least somewhat convincing to Reformed Jews, unitarians, and non-Christian theists. But to Christians, and cer-

tainly to this reviewer, the book as a whole seems thoroughly unconvincing, practically destroying its few good suggestions in its overall wild and weakly-supported thesis.

HERMAN KEITER

*A Centenary History as Related to the Baptist General Conference of America.* By Adolf Olson. Chicago: Baptist Conference Press, 1952. 635 pages. $7.50.

In the course of the last century a total of about 360 Swedish Baptist congregations were organized in the United States. Today there are about 47,000 Baptists of Swedish ancestry in the Baptist General Conference of America, which has preserved its identity and independence despite anglicization. The story of these people is told with great fullness by the professor of Church History in Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, who has included numerous biographical sketches of leaders in connection with his description of events and organizations in which they participated prominently. In addition, congregations, schools, publications, missions, philanthropic institutions, and auxiliary societies are treated at length and in a readable style. Lutherans have a natural interest in this story because of the parallels (and sometimes controversies) between Baptists and Lutherans of Swedish extraction.

*What Americans Believe and How They Worship.* By J. Paul Williams. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952. 400 pages. $5.00.

One of the fruits of the ecumenical movement is a renewed interest in comparative symbolics. The author of this book, professor in the department of Religion in Mount Holyoke College, responds to this interest with an interpretation of the major religious groups in America: Roman Catholics, Lutherans, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Unitarians, Baptists and Disciples, Quakers, Methodists, Jews, and "recent religious innovations" (Adventists, Mormons, etc.). Broadly speaking, the order of treatment is determined by the author's opinion as to the relative weight given to the "supernatural," Roman Catholicism being considered the most "supernatural" and Lutheranism, Anglicanism, etc., following closely after.

Although the emphasis is on the present status of the various groups, some attention is given to historical origins and development. In each case, moreover, extended treatment is given to an American representative of each group who might illustrate, or make concrete, some of the group's characteristics: Cardinal Gibbons for Roman Catholicism, H. H. Muhlenberg for Lutheranism, Bishop Brent for Anglicanism, John Witherspoon for Presbyterianism, etc.

In the eyes of the reviewer the treatment of Roman Catholicism is more satisfactory than that of any other single group. Perhaps this is because more space is devoted to it—73 pages as over against an average of 20 pages for each of the others. Or perhaps this is because a Protestant reader will more readily accept the author's criticisms of Roman Catholicism than the criticisms of some of the other bodies. However, the author's own left-wing position has something to do with this. Is it really characteristic of Protestantism to "believe that every person who earnestly strives to learn God's will—and then lives up to his understanding—has done everything possible to ensure his salvation" (p. 93)? Have things come to such a pass that "salvation by character is at present the typical Protestant point of view" (p. 156)? Curious, too, is the author's conviction that "governmental agencies must teach the democratic ideal *as religion*" (p. 371, italics are the author's).

Although questions might be raised about Professor Williams' judgment, he has obviously made every effort to be objective. "I am a Protestant," he reports, "reared a Methodist, ordained a Congregationalist, and now worshiping with the Quakers as often as I have opportunity" (p. 13). Such a background may well account for the author's interests and point of view. Whatever one might think of his judgments, his treatment is stimulating and readable and will supplement other available materials in this field.

*The American Church of the Protestant Heritage.* Edited by Virgilius Ferm. New York: Philosophical Library, 1953. 481 pages. $6.

The perennial symposiarch, Professor Ferm of Wooster College, once again offers a collection of essays, this time on certain non-Catholic religious bodies in America. The contributors are persons representative of each group and competent to speak for it, fourteen of the twenty-two being professors of church history.

The pattern to be followed by each contributor included an account of the European background of his group, its American development, and its characteristic features in terms of doctrine, polity, organization and work. The result has been a group of chapters presenting descriptive and narrative reports of the various bodies as they exist in the middle of the twentieth century. However, the historical rather than the theological aspects receive the major attention.

The result is much more than a notebook of factual data on religious bodies. The inner spirit and the special emphases of the groups concerned are described. Occasionally such enthusiasm is displayed that the treatment becomes an *apologia.* Strict objectivity is not the aim. As a consequence, where bodies are the result of separations (e.g., Congregationalists and Unitarians) the accounts of the controversy from each side are not fully in accord. This book therefore does a service when it displays the loyalties and tensions which stand in the way of church union.

Twenty-two church bodies or groups of bodies are described. The editor notes his inability to get an essay from any representative of the Pentecostal churches. Also lacking is any treatment of the Assemblies of God or of the Nazarene Church, both of which have over two hundred thousand members, and are therefore much larger than some other bodies included. Nor is the Church of the Four Square Gospel listed. Or are these included in the editor's term "Pentecostal?"

More serious is the omission of reference to churches in the Dominion of Canada. Perhaps it was the editor's intention to apply "American" only to the United States. Yet the United Church is both sufficiently unique and large to deserve attention.

For the most part the chapters represent denominational groupings—all the Lutherans together, all the Baptists, etc. Why the United Presbyterians received separate treatment is not clear. Moreover, there is a chapter on the relatively small Evangelical Mission Covenant Church and related Scandinavian free churches. Because of the denominational groups, the Negro churches receive no special attention. The seven million Negro Baptists get a paragraph; the two million Negro Methodists get half a sentence.

The chapter on the Lutherans was written by the editor, whose name appears on the clerical roll of the Augustana Church. After devoting eight pages to the Lutheran Reformation, the author takes thirteen pages to tell the involved story of Lutheran synods in America. The intricate record is recounted in a manner as lucid to non-Lutherans as is possible in such condensed form.

Two aspects receive attention: the history of the founding of each synod; and its attitude toward confessionalism. Virtually all other matters are omitted. One would learn nothing, for example, of Lutheran foreign missions or of inner mission work.

In matters of detail some corrections could be made. There were Lutherans in New Amsterdam before 1643, as J. O. Evjen has shown. The bodies comprising the American Lutheran Conference are listed correctly, but after the name of the Evangelical Lutheran Church there appears by mistake "(Eielsen Synod)." The Joint Synod of Ohio and the Iowa Synod receive bare mention. And though notice is taken of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U. S. A., and also of the World Council of Churches, the Lutheran World Federation is overlooked.

The book as a whole is a valuable collection of essays. Notes appear at the end of the chapters together with bibliographies. Such evidences of scholarly treatment are accompanied by a sympathetic approach whereby the reader gets to feel something of the life of the church concerned.

W. D. Allbeck

*The Better Church School.* By John Leslie Lobinger. Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1952. 152 pages. $2.

This is a readable, down-to-earth textbook covering the whole range of church school interests. The author, a Congregationalist, has devoted his entire ministry to the cause of better church schools. He has held educational secretaryships in his denomination, is a former president of the Missionary Education Movement and has taught for some years in the Northfield School of Religious Education. His ideals for the church school are high but he does not lose sight of the vast majority of small schools where progress requires many adjustments and much patience.

The author's attitude toward rewards deserves a wide hearing. "The system of awards for attendance, whether in the form of pins or prizes for individuals or class banners for groups, is a sign of defeat. Church schools that are doing the most significant work are doing so without artificial props; the pupil's interest has been attracted to what is really important, not to the reward" (p. 10). He devotes an entire chapter to memory work, a method he supports without apology. His attitude toward direct Bible study will please the Lutheran reader. "There is value in studying the Bible 'as such,' not simply introducing it when it seems to help in the solution of a present day problem. Its study can and should be made interesting; it can be motivated as well as any other study. The teaching program of the church must not only make use of the Bible indirectly, here and there, but must result in a knowledge of the Bible—its character, its stories, its great sections, its meanings, its teachings" (p. 11).

Missionary education the author stresses not as an extra but as an integral part of the whole curriculum. An incidental suggestion for "browsing tables" filled with readable books is worth a trial. Missionary books would, of course, be included. More reading should be encouraged by both pupils and teachers.

For large schools he suggests grading the primary and junior departments into three departments of two years each. This is of doubtful value for our Lutheran schools with materials geared to three years in each department. Outcomes in doing, in living, should be one aim of teaching. Too many teachers think they have "an experience curriculum when they simply talk with their pupils about other people's experiences."

"The educational program of the church," he holds, "is clearly a bigger thing than the work of the church school. It includes the teaching of the sermon, classes for adults, parent training, pastoral counseling before marriage, church activities for young married couples, for all these have value for the Christian family" (p. 75).

The author's long experience in church school work has left him assured as to its future. He writes, "Our confidence that the church school has a future is deep-rooted. It grows out of the fact that almost two and a half million men and women are giving their strength and ability to this work without remuneration. It is based on the knowledge that large numbers of churches are doing an excellent piece of work and that others can do so also. It is due to an awareness of the efforts of every denomination and of the denominations working cooperatively at this Christian education task. It is rooted in the belief that we know what we are driving at and that we are finding ways to realize our objectives. It is based on the faith that Christian people who heard Jesus' words, 'Go, teach,' will not forsake the teaching function of the church."

There is nothing startlingly new in this book. It is not for the specialist in Christian education. It can be recommended for its common sense approach and over-all treatment. Those responsible for the educational program of a parish will find it suggestive.

AMOS JOHN TRAVER

*Pastoral Counseling.* By Frederick R. Knubel. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1952. 102 pages. $1.50.

As a teacher of Practical Theology, this reviewer feels constrained to present this little volume with one word: "Eureka!"

Everyone connected with a theological seminary is aware of the rapidly increasing demand for instruction and information in the area of pastoral counseling which has been expressed by theological students and pastors in recent years. In seeking to meet this need with a fair degree of adequacy in an already crowded curriculum, the Lutheran teacher (and the typical pastor as well) feels a twofold responsibility. First, a clear and sane understanding of the "new" emphasis and techniques in personal counseling which have come to the fore with the advent of Freudianism, psychoanalysis, psychotherapy, "non-directive" counseling and allied movements. A second need, and a very real one for those who take seriously the Lutheran concept of pastoral theology, is for help in understanding these new emphases fairly, objectively and appreciatively without losing sight of the fact that the Christian pastor is a divinely-called shepherd who ministers with a divinely-inspired Word and divinely-given Sacraments.

In these Knubel-Miller Foundation lectures, Dr. Knubel, President of the United Lutheran Synod of New York and New England, has supplied a gratifying answer to that twofold need. One brief paragraph, selected from many gems in this little volume, expresses the author's position. "There are exceedingly few occasions when a pastor ought to give advice to his parishioners. He ought to lead them to make their own decisions. . . . But he withholds from them his greatest treasure if somewhere *in every total situation* he fails to strengthen the Christian framework of their problem, or fails to feed their faith with the revealed Word of God. Toward this skill, psychology and the church need jointly to make studies that so far have never been seriously attempted."

Dr. Knubel has woven into his lectures a comprehensive array of references to the leading writers and practitioners in the field of personal counseling, including many citations from their works and case histories. The book thus provides a good orientation to those who may not have otherwise read widely in the field of "the new psychology." Also valuable in this respect is a chapter devoted to a critical appraisal of leading books in the field of counseling and information on clinics and courses offered in theological seminaries. Although he asserts, "There is no doubt that modern 'dynamic' psychology is in the fad stage," he presents a fair, unbiased and enlightening appraisal of the works and methods of recent and current psychotherapists. Yet ever uppermost is the emphasis, as he puts it, "The pastor, whatever helpful use he gets, and should get, from psychology, must be above all the servant of the divine Savior Jesus Christ and the minister of Christ's revealed Word and instituted Sacraments."

So this little book will henceforth be the first on the list of readings in this reviewer's classes in pastoral counseling. And he is confident that pastors as well as students will find it one of the most enlightening and helpful books among the many publications which continue to appear in this intriguing and challenging area of the Christian ministry.

C. C. MADSEN

*After This Manner.* By J. C. Macaulay. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1952. 86 pages. $1.50.

This is a devotional study of the Lord's Prayer resulting from a series of sermons delivered when the author was pastor of the Wheaton Bible Church. The book is not deeply doctrinal, but it is clearly and concisely written with a pleasant and readable style. The great truths of the prayer are indicated, explained, and applied. No one of us is free from the sin of carelessness in the use of this prayer, and this book helps to remind us of that fact. The book is small and reads swiftly. It is rewarding reading.

CHARLES R. BOMGREN

*Martin Luther.* By May McNeer and Lynd Ward. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953. 96 pages. $2.50.

The familiar story of Martin Luther is here told simply and skillfully and with a touch of imagination. The text by May Mc-

Neer is profusely illustrated with drawings, some of them full-page in color, by Lynd Ward. The handsome volume, 7 by 10 inches, will be treasured by adolescents, and its story will be listened to with interest by those who are younger. Here is an effective antidote to the comic. A similar volume is available on John Wesley.

*Alice in Bibleland.* By George Wills. New York: Philosophical Library, 1953. 54 pages. $2.75.

In the form of a brief playlet, "to be read, not acted," the author presents a precocious thirteen-year-old girl's difficulties with the Bible: the reconciliation of God's grace and wrath, natural law and miracles, providence and prayer, etc. Her pious grandmother is shocked by her questions, her pastor is unable to cope with her logic, but a theological student finally helps her to see things from the point of view of Spinoza. It is a pity that the author, who writes well, could not offer a more satisfactory solution.

*The Easter Story.* Retold by Felix R. McKnight. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1953. 32 pages, small quarto. $2.50.

Trained as a news reporter, and now managing editor of *The Dallas Morning News,* the author refers to himself as "not a Bible student" but "just an ordinary church-going layman." He has here set down, in plain words, a vivid and moving account of the events in the life of Christ from Palm Sunday to Easter. There is no argument—just a straightforward but skillful summary of the biblical narrative accompanied by delicate drawings in several colors. The book will be a welcome gift item.

*Share Christ Today.* Sermons and Addresses from the Lutheran Evangelism Conference. Minneapolis, 1952. Offset. 114 pages.

In order to provide a record for those who attended the Lutheran Evangelism Conference in Minneapolis on January 23-27, 1952, and in order to convey something of the spirit and impact of the Conference to those who were not present, a complete transcript of the Bible studies, sermons, and addresses is here reproduced together with a few pictures of the throngs who gathered in the Minneapolis Armory.

*What Am I Saying?* By Lily M. Gyldenvand. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1952. 68 pages. 75 cents.

This book is aptly described as "a devotional approach to the Apostles' Creed." It contains nothing that is new and little that is not known, but it has much that we need to remind ourselves of time and time again. The author seems to go out of her way to cast aspersions on modern scholarship, and the book represents a very conservative point of view. Blatantly to state that modern scholarship has contributed nothing to our understanding of the Apostles' Creed is to blind ourselves to the work of God in life today. There is much here that commends itself to our reading; there are also things which we might take with a grain of salt.

CHARLES R. BOMGREN

*Sexual Harmony in Marriage.* By Oliver M. Butterfield. Introduction by Nadina Kavinoky, M.D. New York: Emerson Books, 1953. 96 pages. $1.50.

*The Intimate Life, or The Christian's Sex Life.* By Norval Goldenhuys. New York: Philosophical Library, 1953. 96 pages. $2.75.

It has for some time been the practice of clergymen to counsel with couples approaching marriage and to provide them, as the situation might suggest, with appropriate literature. One of the manuals which has long been used in this way by physicians as well as clergymen is Butterfield's *Marriage and Sexual Harmony,* which now appears under a slightly different title and in a form which has been revised thoroughly in the light of experience in its use and advanced knowledge of the subject. The author is a

Methodist clergyman and a professional counselor. His little book treats the physical side of marriage reverently, helpfully, and in the untechnical language of the average lay reader. Equipped with essential illustrations and index, the book is available in a paper-bound edition, for professional distribution, at 50 cents.

Another manual prepared for similar purposes is by J. Norval Goldenhuys, a Dutch Reformed clergyman in South Africa. This is an American imprint edition of a book first published in England. Its treatment is also reverent, but not so thorough as Butterfield's, except in one area: the latter half of the book is devoted to a careful exposition and defense of the rhythm method of birth control. This is the distinguishing feature of the book. After presenting the merits and demerits of contraceptives and total abstinence, the author offers practical and religious arguments in favor of what he calls "the scheme of periodic abstinence." Diagrams are presented for calculating fertile and infertile periods in any woman's cycle.

*Mr. Bradford Gets Around.* By Harding W. Gaylord. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1952. 97 pages. $1.25.

Perry Bradford would be a welcome addition to any community. He would not be the most popular, but he would be among the most interesting. Mr. Bradford is one of those rare individuals who practices his Christianity—perhaps too much so for many of his community associates. Each one of us could very profitably spend the very short time it takes to read this book in its entirety. This is not a book of sermons or of doctrine, but it is a book of Christianity in action. Perry Bradford could be used in most communities today.

CHARLES R. BOMGREN

*Poetic Meditations on the Scriptures.* By Botolf J. Rothnem. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1951. Paper, 72 pages. 75 cents.

Lutherans in America have contributed little to the expression of their faith in forms of poetry. Attempts in this direction deserve encouragement. Almost one hundred poems by one author are here gathered in an unpretentious collection, each prefaced by a Scriptural quotation which presumably inspired it. The collection is uneven. Here and there one encounters imagery like:

Weeping is cleansing rain
Washing the panes of the soul.

But for the most part the verse remains on this level:

Have faith in God's almighty power,
And do His will from hour to hour.

*The Word of Truth.* By Samuel Martin Miller. Rock Island: Augustana Book Concern, 1952. 158 pages. $2.00.

This book is written by the former dean of the Lutheran Bible Institute, and it has appeared as a weekly feature in the *Lutheran Companion,* the weekly publication of the Augustana Lutheran Church. Dr. Miller presents short doctrinal articles based on the Scriptures. This is not a book to be read at one sitting; it should be read over a longer period of time. There is much that would lend itself to discussion, and the book can well be used as a devotional book. The author gives as his purpose "to give instruction in sound doctrine and to present the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation."

CHARLES R. BOMGREN

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY